

SENATE

MONDAY, May 6, 1929

The Rev. Joseph R. Sizoo, D. D., minister of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art ever mindful of Thine own, who knowest how prone we are to forget Thee when health and success attend our way and whose refuge we seek in times of distress and need, we ask Thy forgiveness for our want of gratitude and our lack of filial affection. Grant us for yet another day Thy watchful providence over all our tasks, Thy wise counsel in all our deliberations, Thy sustaining grace in all our needs, and Thy atoning love for all our sins. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, April 29, 1929, when, on request of Mr. JONES and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fletcher	King	Shortridge
Ashurst	Frazier	La Follette	Simmons
Barkley	George	McKellar	Smith
Bingham	Gillett	McMaster	Smoot
Black	Glass	McNary	Steak
Blaine	Glenn	Metcalf	Stelwer
Blease	Goff	Moses	Swanson
Borah	Goldsbrough	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Greene	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Hale	Nye	Townsend
Broussard	Harris	Oddie	Trammell
Burton	Harrison	Overman	Tydings
Capper	Hastings	Patterson	Tyson
Caraway	Hatfield	Phipps	Vandenberg
Connally	Hawes	Pine	Wagner
Copeland	Hayden	Pittman	Walcott
Couzens	Hebert	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Hefflin	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	Warren
Deneen	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Dill	Jones	Sackett	Watson
Edge	Kean	Schall	Wheeler
Fess	Keyes	Sheppard	

Mr. SCHALL. My colleague the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is still ill and confined in a hospital.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE ON DEBENTURE PLAN

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think it is eminently fair to those who favor the debenture plan and those who oppose it to have ample notice of the closing of debate upon that feature of the pending farm relief bill. There are several Senators who desire yet to be heard, and having that matter well in mind and giving it due consideration, I propose the following unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it may be read at the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that after 2 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Wednesday, May 8, 1929, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 10 minutes upon the pending amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to strike out section 10 as amended, relating to the debenture plan.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to enter into an agreement to limit debate and personally I have no objection to the arrangement the Senator suggests. It has been indicated to me, however, by at least one Senator that it would be desirable to make the time limit 15 minutes instead of 10 minutes in view of the fact that some Senators think they will not be able to speak before the time limit goes into effect. I wonder if the Senator from Oregon would be willing to make that modification?

Mr. McNARY. I shall be glad to accommodate those who desire to speak, but I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that the unanimous-consent agreement does not operate until 2 o'clock on Wednesday. There will, therefore, be no limitation on time to speak until Wednesday at 2 o'clock; that is, there will be all of to-day and all of to-morrow and on Wednesday until 2 o'clock for those who desire to speak at length. So far as I am advised there are only five or six Members who desire to deliver set speeches. Consequently it occurs to me that by fixing the time at 2 o'clock on Wednesday no one who desires

to discuss the pending motion to strike out will be denied full opportunity to do so. But if the Senator from Arkansas desires that we amend the request by changing it to 15 minutes instead of 10 minutes I shall enter no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I think we might as well do it. I would not object to moving the time forward when the time limit should go into effect. I think if it went into effect at, say, 1 o'clock on Wednesday it would suit my purpose.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. I would be willing to accede to that modification if it is the desire of Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I do not want to interfere, of course, with the unanimous-consent agreement to vote at any time that may be deemed appropriate upon the very important amendment now before us, but it is obvious that there are many who desire to be heard upon the subject. It may be that to-day and to-morrow will be ample for that purpose. So far as I am concerned, I want to be heard for a very brief period. I would not object to the fixing of an hour to-morrow after which debate should be limited, but I would prefer that it be provided that after the hour named 20 minutes shall be allowed for debate.

We know the difficulties under which individuals in the Senate labor in their endeavors to present their views in a matter of this sort. We know how courteous and kind and considerate the chairman of the committee has been, and I do not want in any degree to interfere with his program. But I do hope that if the unanimous-consent agreement is entered into it will permit, after the hour which shall be named, 20 minutes in which each Senator may be heard upon the pending amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, let me suggest that under the arrangement proposed by the Senator from Oregon the limitation of debate would not go into effect until 2 o'clock on next Wednesday. That would give the entire time throughout to-day and to-morrow and up until 2 o'clock on Wednesday for debate without limitation. The Senate, of course, by regulating its hour of recess or adjournment, could command as much time as might be necessary. I feel that the request made by the Senator from Oregon is a reasonable one, and for my part I am not going to object to it, but I would like to see it modified so as to make the time limit 15 minutes instead of 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON. I suggest that it be made 20 minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If the Senator from Oregon is willing, I have no objection to fixing it at 20 minutes.

Mr. McNARY. Personally I do not think it makes much difference whether the limitation is 10 or 15 or 20 minutes. In my opinion, the debate will be over by 2 o'clock on Wednesday. However, I am willing to accede to the request of the Senator from California.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The unanimous consent is to go into effect at 2 o'clock on Wednesday as the time for the limitation on debate to begin?

Mr. McNARY. It is.

Mr. BRATTON. I understood that the Senator from Oregon agreed to fix the hour at 1 o'clock next Wednesday instead of 2 o'clock?

Mr. McNARY. I made no such request. The suggestion was offered by the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], but I made no request to change the hour from 2 to 1 o'clock.

Mr. BRATTON. I desire to concur in the suggestion and I wondered if the chairman of the committee would accept it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I shall object to that change. I want it to remain at 2 o'clock.

Mr. McNARY. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement as modified will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. As modified, the proposed unanimous agreement reads:

It is agreed by unanimous consent that after 2 o'clock p. m. on the calendar day of Wednesday, May 8, no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 20 minutes upon the pending amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to strike out section 10 as amended, relating to the debenture plan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request for unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the request of the Senator from Oregon as it has been read relates to the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON]. Why does he not provide in the proposed agreement for a vote upon that amendment, any other amendment that may be pending at the time, and upon the bill?

Mr. McNARY. The pending motion is that made by the Senator from Indiana to strike out section 10, referring to the debenture plan, and most of the discussion, of course, will be on that amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. May I state to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] that practically all the debate heretofore has related to the motion of the Senator from Indiana, that other amendments have not yet been actually presented or considered, and I think it will be sufficient for the present to secure an agreement as to taking a vote on that amendment.

Mr. HEFLIN. I think the debate has covered everything under the sun.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. It usually does.

Mr. DILL. I do not understand that by granting unanimous consent Senators will be limited in their speeches to a discussion only of the debenture plan, but that they may discuss the entire bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Technically the pending question is the motion to strike out the debenture plan, and when any Senator speaks it will be construed that he is addressing his arguments to that subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and it is entered into.

SWEARING IN OF SENATOR SHIPSTEAD BY THE CHIEF CLERK

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the following report, which will be read and filed.

The report was read and placed on file, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 4, 1929.

HON. CHARLES CURTIS,
President of the Senate.

SIR: In accordance with your designation of me, under authority of Senate Resolution 52, agreed to on the calendar day of May 3, 1929, to administer the oath of office to HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, Senator elect from the State of Minnesota, I have the honor to report that I this day administered to Mr. SHIPSTEAD the oath of office prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the Senate, to which Mr. SHIPSTEAD subscribed.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully,

JOHN C. CROCKETT,
Chief Clerk United States Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

STATE OF WISCONSIN.

Senate Joint Resolution 19

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to continue the Federal appropriation for maternity and infancy welfare

Whereas the Sheppard-Towner maternity and infancy law, enacted by the Congress in 1921, expires by operation of law on June 30, 1929; and

Whereas the purpose and intent of the law is to reduce maternity and infant mortality with the cooperation of the several States; and

Whereas 43 States, including Wisconsin, have inaugurated and maintained this most important work in cooperation with the Federal Government with remarkable success; and

Whereas a bill is now pending in Congress, known as the Newton bill (H. R. 14070), which proposes an annual appropriation of \$1,000,000 to the Children's Bureau for continuing the work done by the said bureau and the several States to promote the welfare and hygiene of mothers and children and aid in the reduction of infant and maternal mortality: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin respectfully memorialize and urge the Congress of the United States to pass the Newton bill for maternity and infancy welfare and hygiene, or a substantially similar bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution properly attested be sent to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each House of the Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
CHARLES B. PERRY,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE also presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

STATE OF WISCONSIN.

Joint Resolution 58 A

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to grant Federal aid for State reforestation

Whereas vast areas of land in Wisconsin have been recklessly denuded of timber; and

Whereas this area comprising millions of acres is unfit for agriculture and not now needed for that purpose; and

Whereas the supply of timber is decreasing rapidly and reforestation is one of the major problems of our State; and

Whereas the State and counties working jointly can aid in reforesting but a small portion of the area needing it without excessive taxes; and

Whereas while the Federal Government now gives some financial aid to the States under the Clark-McNary Act for forest-fire prevention and forest planting but does not assist in their reforestation undertakings: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin earnestly requests and petitions the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to give Federal aid toward reforestation by States and counties; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, properly attested, be forwarded to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress and to the Wisconsin Senators and Representatives therein.

HENRY A. HUBER,
President of the Senate.
O. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
CHAS. B. PERRY,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Mr. BLAINE presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of legislation continuing Federal appropriations for maternity and infancy welfare and hygiene, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented to-day by Mr. LA FOLLETTE.

He also presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, praying for the passage of legislation granting Federal aid for State reforestation, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented to-day by Mr. LA FOLLETTE.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the directors of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, approved by the Milltown Cooperative Creamery Company, of Milltown, Wis., favoring the imposition of tariff duties "that will give the full extent of protection to producers of dairy and other agricultural products," which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

CARE OF WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, there has been considerable complaint with reference to the want of proper facilities for the care of war veterans in the hospitals all over the country. I ask to have printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations copies of correspondence I have had with Hon. Frank T. Hines, Director of the Veterans' Bureau; Hon. James W. Good, Secretary of War; and Hon. Patrick J. Hurley, Acting Secretary of War.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 2, 1929.

HON. JAMES W. GOOD,

Secretary of War, War Department, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am in receipt of a number of complaints from South Carolinians, both from within and without my State, with reference to a woeful lack of hospitalization facilities for veterans of the World War. From information which I have received I surmise that this condition is general in other States.

It is really a serious and most distressing situation, for, in many instances, where the order for hospital treatment has been granted the sick or wounded veteran is unable to procure an assignment for the reason that the Government hospitals are overcrowded with such patients and no cots or beds are available.

I am writing to inquire whether, by any construction of the law, the War Department could cooperate with the Veterans' Bureau and other Government agencies in providing some means during the present emergency for the relief of these sick and disabled veterans. I would like for you to advise me to what extent the Army hospitals, physicians,

nurses, supplies, cots, etc., could be applied to this purpose and if any contingent or emergency appropriations could be used therefor.

Thanking you for your courtesy and with assurances of my esteem, I am,

Very respectfully,

COLE L. BLEASE.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 6, 1929.

HON. COLE L. BLEASE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BLEASE: I am in receipt of your letter of the 2d instant relative to hospital facilities for World War veterans.

The matters referred to will receive prompt consideration, and I shall be pleased to inform you further as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. GOOD,
Secretary of War.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, April 10, 1929.

HON. COLE L. BLEASE,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BLEASE: Further reference is made to your letter of April 2, 1929, relative to hospital facilities for World War veterans.

The Medical Department of the Army is now cooperating and stands ready at all times to continue cooperating with the Veterans' Bureau to the fullest extent possible in the hospitalization of Veterans' Bureau beneficiaries.

The allotment of beds in Army hospitals made by the Medical Department to the Veterans' Bureau is 2,040 for the current fiscal year, which, I regret to state, is all that can possibly be spared without detriment to the personnel of the Military Establishment. The only way that an increase in this allotment can be made would be an increase of Medical Department personnel, new hospital construction, and larger appropriations for medical supplies.

Trusting that you will appreciate the attitude of the War Department in this matter, I am,

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK J. HURLEY,
Acting Secretary of War.

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 3, 1929.

HON. FRANK T. HINES,
Director United States Veterans' Bureau,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DIRECTOR: I am in receipt of a number of complaints from South Carolinians within and without my State with reference to the lack of hospitalization facilities for veterans of the World War. It is a most distressing situation, for in many instances where the need for hospital treatment is evidenced by an order for same it is denied for the reason that the Government hospitals are crowded with such patients and no cots or beds are available.

I have this day written the Secretary of War requesting that he advise me whether or not it would be feasible for his department to cooperate with the Veterans' Bureau by furnishing Army hospitals, doctors, nurses, supplies, cots, etc., where available to relieve this situation. It appears to be an emergency which demands attention and I would like to know if there are any contingent appropriations which might be used in a matter of this nature.

I am sure that you will agree with me that a sick or wounded or disabled veteran who is in need of attention should have the best that the Government can afford to give him, and when they are being turned away daily because of insufficient accommodations it becomes a matter of grave concern for every Government official and private citizen of this country.

Thanking you for your courteous attention to this subject and with assurances of my esteem, I have the honor to be

Very respectfully,

COLE L. BLEASE.

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,
Washington, April 12, 1929.

HON. COLE L. BLEASE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BLEASE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 3, 1929, concerning the reported lack of hospital facilities for veterans of the World War.

It is true that this bureau is experiencing some difficulty in meeting the immediate demands of veterans for Government hospital accommodations. This condition, however, is confined almost entirely to the psychotic, or mental, type of case, and has been brought about by the demands of veterans with disabilities not attributable to military service in the World War. That the bureau has been able to meet the hospital demands of both the service-connected and non-service-connected cases of the tuberculous and general medical and surgical

types without any particular difficulty is evidenced by the fact that there are now in Government hospitals throughout the country 1,636 unoccupied beds for patients with tuberculous conditions, and 1,160 unoccupied beds for patients with general medical and surgical conditions, notwithstanding that the non-service-connected cases of these types now hospitalized represent approximately 44 per cent and 67 per cent, respectively, of the total hospital load for both types. It might be mentioned that the Congress has not yet definitely indicated the extent to which it desires to provide hospital facilities for patients whose disabilities have not been adjudged to be of service origin.

In my letter to you of March 8, 1929, I mentioned the plans of the bureau with respect to the future enlargement program of the veterans' hospitals at Atlanta and Augusta, Ga., both of which are available to, and utilized by, veterans resident in South Carolina. In addition, I spoke of the effort being made to complete as rapidly as possible the hospital construction program approved at the first session of the Seventieth Congress. This program provides for the acquisition of a gross total of approximately 3,700 beds, the majority of which will be for the neuropsychiatric type of case. However, the net increase in beds under this program will be but approximately two-thirds of the total, as the balance are to replace existing facilities which are either structurally unsuitable for indefinite use or located in leased institutions. Approximately 40 per cent of the beds to be acquired under this authority are now under construction, while the necessary plans are being prepared for a number of other major projects, which it is expected will be on the market by June 30 next. In the carrying out of this program priority consideration has been given in most instances to those projects which will provide beds for neuropsychiatric cases. The completion of this program should not only relieve the demand now being experienced for neuropsychiatric facilities but should also equalize in certain sections of the country the proportion of beds available for non-service-connected cases.

Your suggestion that the Secretary of War cooperate with this bureau in meeting the instant problem has been noted. The extent to which other governmental agencies are cooperating with the Veterans' Bureau in the hospitalization of its beneficiaries may best be exemplified by the following: The United States Army is operating six major hospitals in the United States, located at Hot Springs, Ark.; El Paso, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; San Antonio, Tex.; San Francisco, Calif.; and Washington, D. C. These hospitals on April 1, 1929, made available to beneficiaries of this bureau a total of 2,040 beds, of which number 1,991 were occupied. In addition, this bureau on the same date was utilizing the facilities of 13 naval hospitals, which made available 3,002 beds, of which number 2,759 were occupied. The bureau was also utilizing the facilities of 10 branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers. These homes on the same date made available to the bureau 1,940 beds, of which number 1,584 were occupied.

The matter of using the hospital facilities at certain military posts for the treatment of World War veterans has previously been taken up with the War Department. It was decided that such a course of action would be impractical, due to the fact that the troops at these posts were classed as "mobile" and, in the event of an emergency, the medical officers on duty assigned to the organization would be compelled to accompany the troops, should their presence be required at a point other than their regular post.

In conclusion, it is believed that an analysis of the foregoing facts will clearly indicate that the bureau is making every effort to meet the demands of its beneficiaries for hospital accommodations and that the pressure now being experienced comes from the type of case that the present approved construction program was designed largely to meet.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, Director.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA,
STATE SERVICE OFFICE,
Columbia, February 27, 1929.

Senator COLE L. BLEASE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Inadequate provision for hospitalization of veterans of World War and Spanish-American War places terrible hardship at times. Please use your best efforts in seeing that more beds are made available for use of South Carolina veterans. Time and energy are wasted trying to get beds here and there—and the veteran waits. Hospital extension provided for in May, 1928, at Atlanta has not been started. Will you urge the director of Veterans' Bureau to have work started on this without further delay, and in the meantime make provision for South Carolina veterans until completed. We need more beds, especially for mental cases.

I am writing all Congressmen as also Senator SMITH on this also, and ask the combined efforts of the delegation. It is a worthy cause.

Yours very truly,

E. HENRY CAPPELMANN,
State Service Officer.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 1, 1929.

Hon. FRANK T. HINES,
Director United States Veterans' Bureau,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DIRECTOR: Senator BLEASE begs to inclose herewith for your attention a communication received from the Hon. E. Henry Cappelmann, State service officer, Columbia, S. C., which is self-explanatory.

The Senator is very much interested in this situation, and will appreciate very highly indeed your good offices in behalf of the veterans who are sorely in need of immediate attention and are to be affected by the provisions cited in Mr. Cappelmann's letter.

Very respectfully,

JOHN D. LONG, Secretary.

UNITED STATES VETERANS' BUREAU,
Washington, March 8, 1929.

Hon. COLE L. BLEASE,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BLEASE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 1, 1929, transmitting to this bureau a communication addressed to you by the Hon. Henry E. Cappelmann, State service officer, Columbia, S. C., concerning the need for additional hospital beds for veterans resident in South Carolina, and urging that the approved enlargement program at Atlanta be expedited.

You are advised that the hospital-construction program of the Veterans' Bureau, which was approved at the first session of the Seventieth Congress, and which contained an amount for increasing the capacity of the Atlanta Hospital to 200 beds, is being completed as rapidly as conditions permit and sound judgment dictates. It will be appreciated that it is difficult at times in the carrying out of an extensive program to determine those projects which should receive priority consideration. However, preliminary plans have been drawn and surveys made of the Atlanta project, and it is expected to have this work under contract at least by the coming summer.

That the bureau has recognized the need for additional beds for mental cases developing in South Carolina is evidenced by the fact that provision was made in the construction program recently submitted to the Congress for the erection of additional patient facilities at Augusta, Ga., which institution is now treating most of the mental hospital load from South Carolina. As you are undoubtedly aware, this program failed of passage, but, independent of this, the bureau is making a detailed study of its probable future hospital requirements as the possible nucleus of a further construction program, and you may rest assured that the needs of South Carolina will receive every consideration in that regard. In the meantime the bureau will make every effort to complete the present approved program as rapidly as possible and at the same time, wherever indicated and practicable, will develop its existing facilities so as to meet changes in the hospital load.

Your interest in this matter is appreciated.

The letter addressed to you by Mr. Cappelmann is being returned herewith for your disposition.

Very truly yours,

FRANK T. HINES, Director.

FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I submit a telegram relating to the amendment to the pending bill proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] excluding fresh fruits and vegetables from the operations of the pending bill. I ask that the telegram may be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., May 4, 1929.

Hon. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

I am sincerely hopeful that you will be able to actively support Senator McNARY's amendment excluding fruits and vegetables from the operation of the farm relief bill. Changes affecting an industry that has never yet failed in the marketing and distribution of the fruits and vegetable crops of this country could easily prove more harmful than the ills sought to be cured. The fresh fruit and vegetable industry has, in the main, functioned adequately and efficiently in the distribution of crops and in the absence of any showing of the probability of improvement no good reason appears why fruits and vegetables should not be excluded. I believe this view is shared not only by large and successful cooperative marketing associations but is representative of the feeling of an overwhelming majority of the actual individual distributors. My good friend Congressman Ludlow, I believe, feels the same way.

L. J. KEACH,

Chairman Advisory Board,

National League of Commission Merchants of the United States.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I present various telegrams and letters from fruit growers in Virginia asking that fruits be ex-

cluded from the operations of the so-called farm relief bill. I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD, following this presentation of them.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

WINCHESTER, VA., April 30, 1929.

Senator CARTER GLASS:

Regarding Senate Bill No. 1, there is some little discussion in the apple industry concerning the surplus-control feature. This is included in subsection b of section 6 of the bill. Speaking as president of the Virginia Horticultural Society, I think that apples and peaches should be excluded from the surplus-control feature. I see no objections to the other provisions of the bill and am of the opinion that apples and peaches should remain in the bill except for the purposes of surplus control.

T. B. BYRD.

ROANOKE, VA., April 30, 1929.

Senator CARTER GLASS,

Washington, D. C.:

As exporter of thousand cars Virginia apples can see nothing but ill effects from a stabilization corporation that might affect Virginia apples. It would certainly stop the foreign buyer and financier from coming into this country when he could not judge as to how fruit would be dumped on him; and a hold-back in perishable products only makes ruinous gluts later. We would like to see apples excluded from the farm relief bill, if possible.

JENNINGS BROS. & EASTER.

RICHMOND, VA., May 1, 1929.

Hon. CARTER GLASS:

Every member of the Richmond branch of National League of Commission Merchants United States urgently requests elimination of fresh fruits and vegetables from Senate bill No. 1 on the broad grounds that their perishability requires highly complex, intricate marketing system, and any disturbance thereof may cause hardship rather than relief contemplated by the bill. Further, think elimination pending opportunity to observe the effects this legislation will have on staple commodities very necessary.

RICHMOND BRANCH NATIONAL LEAGUE OF
COMMISSION MERCHANTS,
W. C. CRENSHAW, Secretary.

WAYNESBORO, VA., May 2, 1929.

Hon. CARTER GLASS, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a grower and dealer in apples, I believe that the farm relief bill would be detrimental, and I trust therefore that you can see your way clear to do everything in your power to have apples excluded from the bill.

Very truly,

W. G. ELLISON.

ROANOKE, VA., April 25, 1929.

The Hon. CARTER GLASS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We market the apples packed at our cooperative packing house at Colling, Va., which is located about 9 miles from Roanoke, in the heart of the Botetourt fruit-producing section; and God knows that it is a heartbreaking task to get profitable prices for the growers on this fruit even when everything is going smoothly and the markets are not disturbed by action of the Government.

Since you are from this part of Virginia, you must be acquainted with the difficulties of the fruit growers and realize that their business is sufficiently difficult without it being made more so.

Without a doubt, there are people assisting in the passage of this legislation who are absolutely sincere. But we can not help feeling that the present legislation is utterly impractical and is to the direct disadvantage of both the farmer and the consumer in this country. The passage of this bill will undoubtedly lead to a heavy loss by the Government, which, of course, will have to be borne by the taxpayers, and will undoubtedly create worse conditions in the future for the farmer.

We do not know how you stand on this legislation, but we sincerely hope that you are opposed to it. But even if you are in favor of it, won't you please exclude apples from this bill?

Very truly yours,

THE BOTETOURT PACKING ASSOCIATION (INC.),
J. RAPPE MYERS, Jr., President.

Mr. HARRISON. I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD numerous telegrams which I have received with reference to keeping in the farm bill the fruit provision.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAZLEHURST, MISS., May 5, 1929.

PAT HARRISON, *Washington, D. C.*:

Growers here consider that fruits and vegetables should be fully protected in the farm relief bill, with the same rights and privileges given to other commodities, and you are urged to take steps to protect the truck growers interested in this section.

M. S. McNEIL.

CRYSTAL SPRINGS, MISS., May 3, 1929.

Senator PAT HARRISON,

Washington, D. C.:

Our growers consider vitally necessary that participation fruits and vegetables be reinstated in provisions of farm relief bill, with all privileges, aid, benefits, without restriction.

UNITED GROWERS OF CRYSTAL SPRINGS.

CRYSTAL SPRINGS, MISS., May 3, 1929.

Senator PAT HARRISON,

Washington, D. C.:

Our growers consider vitally necessary that participation fruits and vegetables be reinstated in provisions of farm relief bill, with all privileges, aid, benefits, without restriction.

MISSISSIPPI VEGETABLE UNION (INC.),
W. H. RUSSUM, *Manager*.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., May 3, 1929.

Hon. PAT HARRISON,

Senator, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Sincerely trust you will oppose Senator McNARY's amendment to farm relief bill, striking out fruit and vegetable growers, who represent a vast proportion of our southern farmers, and whose welfare contributes very materially to the South's prosperity. They are as much entitled to relief as the growers of grain or any other staple commodity.

F. W. REIMERS,

President Southern Pine Association.

MERIDIAN, MISS., May 3, 1929.

Hon. PAT HARRISON,

Care of United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We urge reinstatement of fruits and vegetables to full participation of provisions of farm relief bill.

MARION STRAWBERRY GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

BRADENTON, FLA., May 3, 1929.

United States Senator PAT HARRISON,

Washington, D. C.:

Fruit and vegetable growers certainly entitled to same benefits as producers any other commodities. Being sales manager handling over 3,000 cars for cooperative associations, urge complete reinstatement of fruit and vegetables to fully participate all benefits of farm relief. Frankly, we need relief more than some other commodities. Why pick on us?

C. W. GARNER.

CRYSTAL SPRINGS, MISS., May 3, 1929.

Senator PAT HARRISON,

Washington, D. C.:

Our growers consider vitally necessary that participation fruits and vegetables be reinstated in provisions of farm relief bill with all privileges and benefits without restriction.

TRUCK GROWERS ASSOCIATION (INC.).

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the National Horticultural Council objecting to the amendment eliminating fruit from the pending farm relief bill:

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., May 3, 1929.

Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: We note that an amendment was introduced to the farm bill to eliminate fruits and vegetable from its operation. We object strenuously to this amendment and ask your vigorous opposition to the same.

The fruit and vegetable industries are in serious condition the same as general farming. Cost-accounting studies and surveys in a number of the States show this to be the case.

Fruit and vegetable growers deserve the same benefits from the farm relief bill as all other agricultural producers. It would be unjust discrimination to refuse these growers the benefits which we believe will come from this measure.

It is our belief that this amendment is fostered by dealer or shipping interests. There are a number of dealer organizations who style them-

selves as shippers and in this capacity presume to speak for growers. It is entirely improper for them to do so. It is true that some growers are members of these organizations, but they are members as shippers and not as growers.

The National Horticultural Council is a distinctly grower organization. It has in its membership only growers, horticultural societies, and cooperative fruit and vegetable organizations. There are no conflicting interests of any kind. The council represents 45 organizations distributed over the entire country and in addition large numbers of individual growers who are not members of organizations. We are certain it represents a larger number of actual growers of fruits and vegetables than any other organization in the country.

Very truly yours,

NATIONAL HORTICULTURAL COUNCIL,
C. E. DURST, *Executive Secretary*.

Mr. OVERMAN. I present certain telegrams from sundry fruit associations in North Carolina and one from Mr. Paul Garret, of Penn Yan, N. Y., in regard to the elimination of fruit and vegetables from the farm relief bill, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAYBORO, N. C., May 4, 1929.

Senator LEE S. OVERMAN:

Our association is one oldest cooperative third district. Urge full participation fruits and vegetables in all provisions of farm relief bill. Failure to do so we regard gross injustice our growers.

PAMLICO GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

WILMINGTON, N. C., May 3, 1929.

Hon. LEE S. OVERMAN, *Senator*:

Our association one oldest cooperative this district. Urge full participation fruits and vegetables in all provisions of farm relief bill. Failure to do so we regard gross injustice our growers.

WILMINGTON COOPERATIVE TRUCK GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

FAIRMONT, N. C., May 3, 1929.

Senator LEE S. OVERMAN,

Washington, D. C.:

Our association, an old corporation, urges full participation in all provisions pertaining to fruits, vegetables, and potatoes of our farm relief bill. Failure to do so will be regarded an injustice to our growers.

FAIRMONT TRUCKERS' ASSOCIATION,
O. I. FLOYD, *Secretary and Treasurer*.

PENN YAN, N. Y., May 4, 1929.

Senator OVERMAN,

Senate Office Building:

Am advised McNARY resolution cuts out fruits and vegetables from help in farm relief bill. Have been working for years to get relief for our grape growers along sound business lines. McNARY resolution would injure greatly the improved prospects of our growers and affect a large section in this State unfavorably. Please use all your influence to secure any legislation helping the grape industry.

PAUL GARRET.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I have a telegram from the chairman of the Ohio Farm Bureau in opposition to the proposal to eliminate fruits and vegetables from the provisions of the pending bill. I ask that the telegram be read by the clerk in view of the fact that it is similar to a great number of other telegrams on the same subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, May 4, 1929.

Hon. SIMEON D. FESS,

Senate Office Building:

Amendment to McNARY bill eliminating fruit and vegetables as agricultural commodities should be defeated.

L. B. PALMER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegram will lie on the table.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I have some telegrams from various citrus-fruit interests in Florida, protesting against the elimination of fresh vegetables and fruits from the operations of the pending bill. I will not burden the RECORD by reading the telegrams, but they are to the effect I have stated. I will, however, mention the names of the senders. The telegrams have been received from the following: The Clewiston (Fla.) Vegetable Growers' Association; Allen E. Walker, president Florida Citrus Growers' Clearing House Association; Nocatee (Fla.) Vegetable Growers' Association; Clyde A. Bird, president of the Seminole County, Fla., Chamber of Commerce; Florida East Coast Growers' Association; the secretary of the Fort Pierce,

Fla., Chamber of Commerce, and other organizations and citizens of Fort Pierce; the Bartow, Fla., Chamber of Commerce; and L. M. Rhodes, of Jacksonville, Fla.; and also a letter from the National Horticultural Council of Chicago, Ill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegrams referred to by the Senator from Florida will lie on the table.

CLEWISTON, FLA., May 4, 1929.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

Senate Chamber:

We respectfully urge defeat of amendment excluding fruits and vegetables from benefits of farm relief bill. We want full benefits this legislation for our growers. Believe this amending is advocated indirectly by organized interests not friendly to our growers' interests.

CLEWISTON VEGETABLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

WINTERHAVEN, FLA., May 4, 1929.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate:

Understand Senator McNARY introduced amendment farm bill excluding fruit and vegetables its benefits. Serious matter. Please advise status of affairs.

ALLEN E. WALKER,

President Florida Citrus Growers' Clearing House Association.

ARCADIA, FLA., May 4, 1929.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

Washington, D. C.:

Producers of fruits and vegetables need farm relief more than some other commodity groups. We are surprised at amendment to farm bill which deprives us of such benefits, and urgently request defeat of this amendment or any other which may be offered to prevent our growers from getting fullest benefits of such legislation.

NOCATEE VEGETABLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

SANFORD, FLA., May 4, 1929.

DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Informed effort will be made in Senate to eliminate fruits and vegetables from the benefits of new agricultural bill. Seminole County Chamber of Commerce protests against such discrimination and urge you oppose such actions with all your power.

CLYDE A. BYRD, President.

MIAMI, FLA., May 4, 1929.

Senator D. U. FLETCHER,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We consider the packing, warehousing facilities, and credit features of pending farm relief bill in Senate are of great value to fruit and vegetable growers and shipping organizations. We understand Senator McNARY has entered an amendment eliminating fruit and vegetables from the bill. To deny Federal aid to producers of fruit and vegetables and grant aid to producers other commodities grossly unfair, and we ask that fruits and vegetables be included for full participation all provisions farm relief bill.

FLORIDA EAST COAST GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

FORT PIERCE, FLA., May 4, 1929.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Absolutely necessary that provision in farm relief bill pertaining to help for fruits and vegetables be retained. Any representation to the contrary unquestionably prompted by parties not having best interest of growers at heart.

W. I. Fee, chairman St. Lucie County Growers League; Franklyn Tyler, president Kiwanis Club; Mrs. D. H. Saunders, president Fort Pierce Women's Club; T. H. Banes, city manager; Homer Needles, president Fort Pierce Growers Association; J. W. Brewer, commander American Legion; J. P. Newell, president Rotary Club; Margaret Frere, president Business and Professional Women's Club; C. H. Edwards, county commissioner; R. L. Goodwin, secretary Fort Pierce Real Estate Board; B. R. Kessler, secretary Fort Pierce Chamber of Commerce.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 3, 1929.

Senator DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We note that an amendment was introduced to the farm bill to eliminate fruits and vegetables from its operation. We object strenuously to this amendment and ask your vigorous opposition to the same.

The fruit and vegetable industries are in serious condition the same as general farming. Cost accounting studies and surveys in a number of the States show this to be the case.

Fruit and vegetable growers deserve the same benefits from the farm relief bill as all other agricultural producers. It would be unjust discrimination to refuse these growers the benefits which we believe will come from this measure.

It is our belief that this amendment is fostered by dealer or shipping interests. There are a number of dealer organizations who style themselves as shippers and in this capacity presume to speak for growers. It is entirely improper for them to do so. It is true that some growers are members of these organizations, but they are members as shippers and not as growers.

The National Horticultural Council is a distinctly grower organization. It has in its membership only growers, horticultural societies, and cooperative fruit and vegetable organizations. There are no conflicting interests of any kind. The council represents 45 organizations distributed over the entire country, and in addition large numbers of individual growers who are not members of organizations. We are certain it represents a larger number of actual growers of fruits and vegetables than any other organization in the country.

Very truly yours,

NATIONAL HORTICULTURAL COUNCIL,
C. E. DURST, Executive Secretary.

BARTOW, FLA., May 6, 1929.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

McNARY amendment to farm relief bill, excluding fruit and vegetable growers from benefit of bill, would work hardship to growers of Florida, and this organization hopes it will not be permitted to pass.

BARTOW CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., May 6, 1929.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate:

Received following telegram from E. W. Stillwell, California Vineyardists Association:

"Advised National League Commission Merchants Western Fruit Jobbers will foster new amendments to prevent fruits and vegetables forming stabilization corporations, thus removing all chances of financial assistance to these industries. New amendments will appear to-morrow morning for vote, therefore necessary wires go to-day protesting this latest move of receivers to prevent perishable industry getting help through Government financing. We are insisting perishables are entitled to same help as other crops; in fact, need it worse. Please act quick. Thanks."

By all means let the fruit and vegetable growers have equal privileges with all other agricultural producers.

L. M. RHODES.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I have quite a number of telegrams and letters protesting against the elimination of fruits and vegetables from the operations of the bill, or the failure to include them, whichever may be the case. I have left the letters and telegrams at my office, but I desire to have permission to put them in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The telegrams were ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

BAYBORO, N. C., May 4, 1929.

Senator F. M. SIMMONS:

Our association is one of the oldest cooperative, in the third district. Urge full participation fruits and vegetables in all provisions of farm relief bill. Failure to do so we regard gross injustice to our growers.

PAMLICO GROWERS ASSOCIATION.

DURHAM, N. C., May 4, 1929.

Senator F. M. SIMMONS:

We respectfully urge defeat of amendment excluding fruits and vegetables from benefits of farm relief bill. We want full benefits of this legislation for our growers. Believe this amendment is advocated indirectly by organized interests not friendly to our growers' interest.

PINEHURST FOOD PRODUCTS CORPORATION.

FAIRMONT, N. C., May 3, 1929.

Senator F. M. SIMMONS,

Washington, D. C.:

Our association, an old corporation, urges full participation in all provisions pertaining to fruits, vegetables, and potatoes of our farm relief bill. Failure to do so will be regarded an injustice to our growers.

FAIRMONT TRUCKERS' ASSOCIATION,
O. I. FLOYD, Secretary and Treasurer.

Mr. HATFIELD presented telegrams relative to the provision covering fresh fruits and vegetables in the pending farm relief bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HENRY D. HATFIELD,

United States Senate:

Want fresh fruits, vegetables eliminated Senate bill 1. Account perishability requires intricate marketing systems. Fear any disturbance cause us more hardship rather than betterment. Why not eliminate pending opportunity observe effects legislation on staple commodities before including?

C. A. ROBRECHT Co.,
Wholesale Fruits and Vegetables.

MAY 1, 1929.

Senator HENRY D. HATFIELD,

United States Senate:

Want fresh fruits, vegetables eliminated Senate bill 1. Account perishability requires intricate marketing systems. Fear any disturbance cause us more hardships rather than betterment. Why not eliminate pending opportunity observe effects legislation on staple commodities before including?

JEBBIA & METZ,
Wholesale Fruits and Vegetables.

MAY 1, 1929.

Senator H. D. HATFIELD:

Representing growers with tonnage ranging from 1,000 to 1,500 cars apples per year, I am, at their suggestion, wiring you to request that you lend your efforts in opposition to the inclusion of apples in any phase of the farm relief bill. The apple industry on sound basis. Does not need this so-called relief.

J. F. WILSON.

MAY 1, 1929.

Senator H. D. HATFIELD,

Senate Office Building:

Exclusion of apples and pears from farm relief bill most vital to the welfare of orchardists of State. Please lend your efforts to exclusion of same in farm relief bill now pending.

WEST VIRGINIA HORTICULTURAL SOCIETY.

APRIL 30, 1929.

Senator H. D. HATFIELD,

Senate Office Building:

We are bitterly opposed farm relief bill including perishables. Can see no help constructive nature as outcome and contrary detrimental results are obvious. Any governmental gesture in the exporting of perishables most hazardous to a now satisfactory situation. As largest producers apples in Appalachian section, we demand your support in the exclusion of perishables from farm relief bill.

AMERICAN FRUIT GROWERS.

MAY 4, 1929.

Senator HENRY D. HATFIELD:

Request that you support amendment to farm relief bill excluding fruits and vegetables.

J. G. MAPLES.

MAY 1, 1929.

Senator HENRY D. HATFIELD,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Want fresh fruits vegetables eliminated Senate bill on account perishability. Requires intricate marketing system. Fear any disturbance cause us more hardship rather than betterment. Why not eliminate pending opportunity observe effect legislation on staple commodities before indulging?

W. H. METZNER.

MAY 1, 1929.

Senator HENRY D. HATFIELD,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Want fresh fruits vegetables eliminated Senate bill on account perishability. Requires intricate marketing system. Fear any disturbance cause us more hardship rather than betterment. Why not eliminate pending opportunity observe effect legislation on staple commodities before indulging?

FRANK J. GARDNER,
Wholesale Produce.

MAY 1, 1929.

Senator HENRY D. HATFIELD,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Want fresh fruits vegetables eliminated Senate bill on account perishability. Requires intricate marketing system. Fear any disturbance cause us more hardship rather than betterment. Why not eliminate pending opportunity observe effect legislation on staple commodities before indulging?

CHESTER FRANZELL & Co.

Senator H. D. HATFIELD,

Washington, D. C.:

We strenuously object discrimination against fruit and vegetable producers, and respectfully request reinstatement fruits and vegetables to secure full benefit all provision farm relief bill.

INWOOD FRUIT GROWERS CLUB.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, one day last week the matter of eliminating fruits came up for discussion. I was necessarily absent. In view of the fact that there are many telegrams being presented now with reference to the matter, I have one telegram of the many which I have received which I desire to ask may be read. The other telegrams I will not insert in the RECORD and probably will not present them to the Senate until the matter comes up, but I ask that this telegram from one of our leading commercial organizations engaged in the fruit business may be read with reference to the exclusion especially of apples and pears from the provisions of the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

YAKIMA, WASH., May 1, 1929.

Hon. WESLEY L. JONES,

Washington, D. C.:

Respectfully urge you to use your efforts to exclude perishables, including fruits and vegetables, from provisions of farm relief bill now pending in Senate, because marketing of perishables is a highly organized and efficiently functioning industry which would be seriously disturbed if the bill were made applicable thereto, and any attempt to apply provisions of said bill to our industry would utterly demoralize it, cause withdrawal of private capital now available in both domestic and foreign trade, and cause heavy losses to producers. The perishable industry is already adequately provided with storage and marketing facilities. Foreign outlets have been developed to a high degree through private enterprise of individual shippers and marketing organizations, including cooperatives, and are being constantly expanded into new markets. So effective has been the marketing of perishables in foreign countries that for the season 1928, with the largest crop of apples in history of Northwest, exports of this product have exceeded those of any former year, and the prices obtained from foreign markets have equaled and at times exceeded those prevailing in domestic markets, with general results much better than in former heavy crop years. Foreign sales of perishables are being made principally at agreed prices f. o. b. shipping points or ports in the United States, with foreign capital placed in American banks on safe and sound basis, and governmental plans such as are proposed in pending measures will wreck the entire fabric of foreign trade in perishables that has been built up on sound business principles over a long period of years. The undersigned, as a grower owning and operating several thousand acres of land devoted to production of fruits and vegetables and as an organization specializing in marketing of perishables for thousands of growers in all parts of the United States, respectfully urges you not to permit our industry to suffer the terrible blow that would fall upon it and cause untold losses to ourselves and the growers we represent should any attempt be made to revolutionize and demoralize our industry under provisions of the bills now pending under the name of farm relief. Appreciate that the fanatical and hysterical pressure being exerted on all sides in favor these and even more drastic provisions presents a serious individual problem to each Senator and Congressman, but no man can afford to yield to such pressure, realizing the chaos with attendant loss and suffering to millions of growers that would follow the application of such revolutionary measures to the highly specialized, intricate, and vital business of marketing fruits and vegetables. Our belief is that proposed law is utterly infeasible for perishables and will never be applied thereto, but unless perishables are excluded from the bill attempts will be made to apply its provisions thereto, resulting in long-drawn-out agitation and controversy, which, along with the ever-present potential danger hanging over the industry, will stifle further development and intimidate domestic and foreign capital and those engaged in the distribution of perishables.

AMERICAN FRUIT GROWERS (INC.),
F. E. MILLER, Regional Manager.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegrams will lie on the table.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I simply want to say that I have, I think, two telegrams from smaller organizations in my State taking the opposite position. I will present them when the amendment comes up for consideration in connection with the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, this is not the appropriate time, of course, to discuss the amendment. I do not wish to do so; but I can not permit a telegram of that sort to pass unchallenged, in view of the hundreds of telegrams that have come to me in the last few days of quite the contrary character.

In these telegrams that have thus been sent me it is asserted that if the amendment in general terms be adopted it will mean that this bill will strike at cooperatives the severest blow that could possibly be aimed at them in any measure before the Congress or that might be presented to the Congress.

I have not numbered the Record with the telegrams that I have received, and I do not intend to; but I could not permit the one organization that is making the statements that have just been read to have those statements go to the Senate unchallenged in any aspect.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Washington a question with reference to the telegram which he inserted in the Record. Is the sender of that telegram a commission merchant? Is it an organization in the nature of commission merchants?

Mr. JONES. He says in his telegram that he is a large grower. I think the organization is also connected with the purchasing and shipment of fruit.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to ask the Senator, as the telegram comes from his State, whether the sender of the telegram is principally a commission merchant, an exporter, a dealer, a marketer of fruit?

Mr. JONES. That I do not know.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator can not give me any information along that line?

Mr. JONES. None except that which is contained in the telegram in which the sender states that he is a grower of several thousand acres of fruit.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, in answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Georgia, I will state that the American Fruit Growers are primarily commission merchants, a marketing agency. They do operate some groves and some farms. They operate practically all over the country. They are probably the largest independent marketing agency in the State of Florida, for instance.

Mr. GEORGE. The sender of this telegram?

Mr. TRAMMELL. The American Fruit Growers. They operate pretty well all over the country. They are about the largest independent marketing organization in the country.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I can very well understand how a commission merchant, a dealer in perishable products, would favor the striking from this bill of all provisions relating to fruits and vegetables.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator that I have other telegrams here from some organizations in Yakima that I do know are composed of many actual growers of fruits.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the point.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I think it rather unhappy that we should have agreed upon a particular time to vote on a bill which nobody seems to understand. One Senator rises and protests against the inclusion of fruits, and immediately another one rises and vehemently argues in the other behalf.

I come from the third largest apple-growing State in the Union. The Senator from Washington comes from the first. All of the apple and peach growers of Virginia, if I am accurately informed, are violently protesting against the inclusion of apples and peaches in this bill. I wonder if there is anybody who has thoroughly considered this farm relief bill who can tell us just exactly what will be the result of the inclusion of this provision?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, the Senator speaks of an agreement being made to vote on the bill. I do not understand that that is the case.

Mr. GLASS. I simply used that as a text to make a speech.

Mr. JONES. I expect to discuss this matter when my amendment comes up.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Georgia to the fact that the growers of apples in the Northwest are intimately connected with the men who sell the apples. In fact many of the growers are in merchandising organizations; and it is almost impossible to separate the growers from those who are selling the apples, they are so united. Therefore it is hardly possible to segregate the grower from the organization of the men who sell the fruit.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I realize that what the Senator from Washington says is true. I merely want to repeat that I can well understand and appreciate why the commission merchant, the merchant in perishable products, will oppose the bill as it stands and would desire to amend it; and I can also appreciate why a man who is both a grower and a merchant, if his merchandising interest predominates, would likewise desire the same thing.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I have a number of telegrams from different producers in Idaho protesting against the amendment. I also have a telegram from the governor of our State, which I should like to have read, and a telegram

from the chamber of commerce of one of the largest producing communities, which I should like to have read. I do not care to encumber the Record with the others.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

BOISE, IDAHO, May 4, 1929.

Hon. JOHN THOMAS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Am informed the words "fruit and vegetables" have been removed from agricultural bill. If this is true, will deprive two of Idaho's important industries of benefits accruing under this proposed agricultural relief measure. Strongly urge you use your influence to have fruit and vegetable industries included in provisions of this legislation.

H. C. BALDRIDGE, Governor.

CALDWELL, IDAHO, May 4, 1929.

Hon. JOHN THOMAS,

United States Senate:

All growers maintain it is absolutely necessary that participating fruit and vegetables be reinstated in provisions farm relief bill with every privilege and benefit, without restriction. Caldwell shipped in past four years 2,434 carloads fruits and vegetables.

JAMES G. SMITH,

Secretary Caldwell Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I want to make it plain to the Senate that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has put his finger upon the crux of the situation that is presented by what has occurred here this morning in relation to the amendment to exclude perishable fruits and vegetables; and upon that line the contest undoubtedly will be waged in the Senate when the amendment is reached.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to suggest to the Senator from California that the amendment I have offered refers only to apples and pears.

Mr. JOHNSON. I realize that.

HEARINGS BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEES

Mr. DENEEN, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, reported back favorably, without amendment, the following Senate resolutions authorizing hearings before various committees, and they were considered by the Senate and agreed to:

Senate Resolution 39, submitted by Mr. FRAZIER on April 24, 1929:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-first Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the session or recess of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 40, submitted by Mr. METCALF on April 24, 1929:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the Seventy-first Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 41, submitted by Mr. WATERMAN on April 24, 1929:

Resolved, That the Committee on Patents, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized, during the Seventy-first Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 43, submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Idaho on April 26, 1929:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized during the Seventy-first Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the com-

mittee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 44, submitted by Mr. SHORTRIDGE on April 26, 1929:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-first Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 46, submitted by Mr. LA FOLLETTE on April 29, 1929:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-first Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per 100 words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate.

CLERKS TO CHAIRMAN OF MAJORITY CONFERENCE

Mr. DENEEN. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably with an amendment Senate Resolution 50, submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] on April 30, 1929, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was, in line 2, after the word "employ," to insert "as chairman and as Senator," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the chairman of the conference of the majority of the Senate hereby is authorized to employ, as chairman and as Senator, a clerk at \$3,300 per annum, an assistant clerk at \$2,500 per annum, two assistant clerks at \$2,150 each per annum, and one assistant clerk at \$1,830 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES TO WILLIAM S. VARE

Mr. DENEEN. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 54, submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE] on the 4th instant, to reimburse WILLIAM S. VARE for certain expenses in connection with his claim to a seat in the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered by the Senate and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the Senate, fiscal year 1928, to WILLIAM S. VARE \$15,907.38 for reimbursement for expenses incurred in collecting and impounding ballot boxes ordered by the Senate in 61 counties of Pennsylvania, as evidenced by vouchers from United States marshals in possession of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, authorized by resolution of December 17, 1927, to hear and determine the contest between William B. Wilson and the said WILLIAM S. VARE for membership in the United States Senate.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 966) for the relief of Francis Leo Shea; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 967) granting the consent of Congress to the construction of a highway bridge across the Hudson River between the cities of Albany and Rensselaer, N. Y.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 968) for the relief of Anna Faceina;

A bill (S. 969) for the relief of Edna B. Erskine; and

A bill (S. 970) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court for the Southern District of New York to hear and determine the claim of the owner of the French auxiliary bark *Quevilly* against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A bill (S. 971) authorizing the use of tribal moneys belonging to the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indians of Oklahoma for certain purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 972) for the relief of Guy Swan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOSES:

A bill (S. 973) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie M. Lindsay (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. METCALF:

A bill (S. 974) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Cook (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 975) for the relief of Catherine McLinden; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 976) granting a pension to Jennie Sanford Harvey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOFF:

A bill (S. 977) for the relief of Mrs. W. M. Kittle; and

A bill (S. 978) for the relief of Sarah E. Edge; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 979) for the relief of Henry C. Perrine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 980) to extend benefits under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, to Herbert L. Burge; and

A bill (S. 981) to extend benefits under the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, to James L. Hannon; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 982) to amend the act entitled "An act reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 983) to amend section 14 of the national defense act;

A bill (S. 984) to regulate computation of percentage of active pay to be paid as retired pay to officers of the Army;

A bill (S. 985) to credit certain officers of the Army with service at the United States Military Academy; and

A bill (S. 986) to amend section 90 of the national defense act, as amended, relative to the employment of caretakers for National Guard organizations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 987) to authorize an appropriation to cover damages to an automobile of William H. Baldwin; and

A bill (S. 988) for the relief of Franz J. Jonitz, first lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COUZENS:

A bill (S. 989) granting an increase of pension to Annie Young; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 991) to grant unreserved nonmineral lands to the several States; and

A bill (S. 992) granting certain public lands to the State of New Mexico to aid said State in the construction of public roads and in the maintenance of public schools and public institutions of learning; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A bill (S. 993) to authorize appropriations for buildings, sites, and other facilities for the public schools of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 994) for recognition of meritorious service performed by Chief Gunner Clarence L. Tibbals; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 995) granting a pension to John McHenry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) conferring the rank, pay, and allowances of a major of Infantry to date from March 24, 1928, upon Robert Graham Moss, late captain, Infantry, United States Army, deceased; and

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 32) to provide for appropriate military records for persons who, pursuant to orders, reported for military duty, but whose induction into the service was not, through no fault of their own, formally completed on or prior to November 30, 1918; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF WORLD WAR VETERANS' ACT, 1924

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. At the request of the American Legion, I introduce a bill to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, and ask that it be referred to the Finance Committee. The bill (S. 990) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I request that a brief explanation of this bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, from the report made on H. R. 16819 by the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, in the House of Representatives, Seventieth Congress, second session.

The amendment proposed to section 19 of the World War veterans' act of 1924 was included in H. R. 16819 and passed the House of Representatives during the Seventieth Congress, second session, but was not acted upon in the Senate.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[H. Rept. No. 2392, 70th Cong., 2d sess.]

AMEND WORLD WAR VETERANS' ACT, 1924

February 6, 1929.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, submitted the following report to accompany H. R. 16819:

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 16819) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, having considered the same, reports thereon with the recommendation that it be passed. The bill as now presented proposes several substantial changes to which the attention of the House of Representatives is specifically directed. They are as follows:

2. Section 2 of the bill proposes to amend section 19 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, which relates to the filing of suits on insurance, by including therein a provision authorizing the court as part of judgments entered thereunder to direct the refund of unearned premiums, and also by authorizing the issuance of subpoenas for witnesses who are required to attend the trials, these subpoenas to run from any district into another; provided that in the event the witness lives out of the district in which the court is held at a greater distance than 100 miles from the place the court is held, the permission of the court must be had. Prior to September 19, 1928, the district courts had authority to issue subpoenas under the circumstances mentioned, this authority being contained in section 654, title 28, United States Code, the operation of which, however, expired, by its own terms, on September 19, 1928, since which date the United States district courts have had no authority in civil cases to subpoena witnesses living in a different district a greater distance than 100 miles from the place in which the court is held. Defense witnesses in most of the insurance suits live more than 100 miles from the district court in which the suits are brought, and although authority exists for the taking of testimony of such witnesses by deposition, this method is unsatisfactory and the defense of the Government is restricted and hampered by the limitations of the present law. This amendment is recommended by the director. The bill further proposes to amend section 19 by the inclusion of a paragraph under which the director will be authorized to order part-time and fee-basis employees of the bureau to appear as witnesses in suits against the Government under this section and to pay them, in his discretion, a fee in an amount not to exceed \$20 per day. The Comptroller General has ruled that the Government is unauthorized to pay as expert witnesses in the trial of insurance suits physicians who are already in the employ of the Government on a part time or fee basis, on the theory that the payment of a witness fee in addition to the usual compensation paid them as part-time salaries or as fees by the bureau would be double payment to these employees. This lack of authority in the bureau to use and pay as witnesses physicians who are familiar with the cases in suits also hampers the Government in its defense.

AMENDMENTS TO FARM RELIEF BILL

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. COPELAND, and Mr. BROOKHART each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to Senate bill 1, the farm relief bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF STANDING RULE XXV

Mr. BINGHAM submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 55), which was ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved, That the last paragraph of section 1 of Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows: "Committee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, to consist of 14 Senators."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the bill (H. R. 2158) making an appropriation for defraying the expenses of the United States Marine Band in attending the Confederate Veterans' Reunion to be held at Charlotte, N. C., June 4 to June 7, inclusive, 1929, and it was signed by the Vice President.

UNIFICATION OF RAILROADS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR FESS

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, on last Saturday night the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess] delivered a very illuminating address over the Washington Star weekly radio forum on the subject of Railroad Consolidation. I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The commercial progress of the Nation has been phenomenal. One of the chief agencies of that growth is transportation, including steam, water, highway, and aerial. Steam transportation has advanced to the point where we now have the most efficient service in the world. Water transportation will receive more and more attention. Highway traffic is increasing by leaps and bounds, and air navigation is the newest, and will take a wide range in the near future. I will speak only to-night of steam transportation, with reference to the one outstanding problem of securing the maximum utilization of transportation facilities.

The problem of railroad unification is to reduce from many to a few systems. Steam transportation to-day is owned by nearly 2,000 companies, and is operated by nearly 1,000 separate organizations. The problem is to reduce them to, say, 20 systems. On an average that would consolidate the more than 250,000 miles of road into systems of around 10,000 miles each. It does not mean, of course, that each system will be equal to every other system.

The unification proposal is based upon the principle of concentration and control. Concentration is the order of modern industry. To forbid it is to reject the essentials of modern progress. It is in the interest of increased efficiency and sound economy. Control, however, is necessary in the public interest, which, after all, is the real test of all legislation.

The element of aggression in the use of power tends to take advantage of the public unless held in check, hence the necessity of control. This principle was recognized in the act of 1920 but little progress has been made since that date. In accordance with the mandate of the law requiring a complete plan of unification, a tentative plan, at the request of the commission, was submitted by Professor Ripley, of Harvard, which, after consideration, was not accepted by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Later the commission submitted its own tentative plan, but did not regard it satisfactory, and later it recommended to Congress the repeal of this mandate as an impracticable requirement. After eight years of failure to produce a plan, having virtually abandoned that part of the statute, the commission is again working upon such a plan, but as yet has not reached a final decision.

Recommendation by the commission is also made (1) forbidding any unification without the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, this is to give the commission greater authority over the subject; (2) power to reject unification unless specific line or lines are included, this is to insure against the abandonment of weak roads; and (3) some other minor changes, such as the financial set-up, involving bonds and stocks, nonpar stock, stock of voting privileges.

Amendments to the present law to facilitate unification have been urged by the commission, and also by Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, all of whom have expressed their conviction of the advantage of the same in no uncertain terms. In accordance with these recommendations bills were introduced in both branches of Congress. I introduced a bill in the last Congress, which the Committee on Interstate Commerce reported, but failed to get action. I reintroduced it in this special session. The policy of unification is supported by the American Railway Association, representing the class A roads, which includes the systems providing 90 per cent of rail revenues. It is supported by the Short Line Association, representing class B and C roads; by the Industrial Traffic League, representing the shipping public; and by economists and students of transportation. In fact, thus far the associations which have spoken are in favor of the policy. In the hearings on the bills no one appeared in opposition to the proposal. On the other hand, voluminous data were assembled in favor of the bills which were reported by the committees of both houses.

The touchstone of this proposal is the public interest. Any and all legislation to be justified must meet this test. While it should respect the rights of the owner in profitable investment, which is the primary interest of the investor, and while it should respect the rights of labor, which is the chief concern of employment, in a proper standard of wage, it must also respect the rights of the public, the third party to the contract, in adequate service, which, after all, is the final test of all

legislation. In fact, all such legislation should regard the third party, the public, as of chief concern.

In the public interest unification must retain necessary competition, which is essential protection to the public. While there will be unification of lines there must be competition between systems. It must also avoid any undue lessening of existing competition. Competition in service is the surest guaranty of proper regard for adequate public interest, while absence of competition is the certain jeopardy, if not abandonment of adequate service. Unification on these lines will insure many benefits to the public. It will insure economy in operation. The larger system can make better use of its more ample equipment than the smaller with its limited equipment. It will permit more direct routing of cars and less back-hauling of freight.

It will make available direct lines for fast freight. It will reduce the cost of switching. The number of junction points will also be reduced to the minimum. It will insure standardization of methods and equipment, maximum utilization of shops and equipment, and concentration of purchasing agencies. These changes obviously will operate in the interest of economy.

Unification will doubtless insure better service by strengthening credit facilities, which will permit additions and betterments in both equipment and road beds. A great system will be in a better position to make direct and fast shipments, to supply the demand for cars of special type, and to give regular and more adequate and satisfactory service by each system connecting with another system. Such a plan will permit the operation of solid trains to and from large centers with a maximum use of terminals. It would insure uniform service throughout the year. It would also lessen and simplify the problems of regulation. It is obvious that the Interstate Commerce Commission, now dealing with nearly 2,000 companies, with their varied complaints, would be greatly relieved if these could be reduced to a score more or less of systems. If the revision of the rate structure will permit of a reduction of rates in the interest of agriculture, so militantly demanded by many people of the agricultural West it can only be done through a plan of unification. For after all the public is more concerned over adequate than cheaper service.

Whatever else may be urged as argument for the unification of roads, the primary or conclusive reason is the strengthening of the weak lines; first, to insure more adequate transportation; and, secondly, to avoid Government ownership. I fully agree with the late Senator Cummins that we have the alternative of preserving the weak lines through unification, or the adoption of Government ownership of transportation.

There are many railroad companies, totaling thousands of miles of roads, which have ceased to be profitable, either through lack of equipment or traffic by the exhaustion of sources, such as in the working-out of mines, the exhaustion of oil sources, the cutting off of the forests, etc., or the failure may be due to bad management. Both the Ripley and the commission plans designed as complete plan omitted many of these weak roads, many thousands of miles. Whatever be the cause of the condition and failure of these roads, they supply a service for the communities built up by these transportation lines. To abandon these roads because of loss in their operation would be to abandon the people of the community. It must be conceded that independent operation can not continue indefinitely at a loss. If the alternative is presented to either abandon the roads, or operate them by the Government, the latter will be the controlling alternative. These roads, under such a situation, are sufficient in number and influence to dominate sentiment for Government ownership. If this policy is once entered upon to cover these weak roads, the next step will be the inclusion of the strong roads. The average American citizen does not realize the strength of Government ownership sentiment in the country. It is heard in the halls of Congress, where it has powerful advocates. It is strongly promulgated by influential publications, as well as in the forums of public opinion, by propagandists of no mean ability.

It regards public utilities, such as communication agencies—telephone, telephone, and radio—its realm for immediate agitation. The advocates of Government ownership scan power development, especially hydroelectric, as within their field, and are by no means excluding transportation as a public function and within the realm of the Government. There can be little doubt of what will be done in case no way is found to preserve these roads which can not continue as independent lines. The public will not permit their abandonment. The only alternative in sight for Government ownership is unification, by which a line, weak as independent, may become a source of profit as a feeder of a general system. A great system is due to its feeders, each of which may serve as a profit to the system, while it could not exist alone. One system made up of 100 branches, taken together, may be profitable, which, if operating as a hundred separate systems, would be unprofitable.

In the other way around, we may have a region served by 100 separate and unprofitable roads, which, if consolidated into one or more systems with a unified management and equipment, might quite profitably insure a better public service. It is on that basis that the principle of unification has been and is now being urged. It at once enlisted and stimulated the support of all classes, who look on Government ownership as unwise, and will provoke the opposition of those

who view the policy of Government ownership as the better plan of operation.

The strong urgency for unification to include all lines, on the one hand, and the hesitancy of systems to include roads obviously weak, on the other, has created sentiment for compulsory unification. It is urged in some quarters that by some authorities that compulsion is necessary if unification is desired. It is declared that managers will not consolidate themselves out of a job by voluntary action. I am not convinced that compulsion is wise. The pending bill is not compulsory but voluntary, which looks to consolidation as a rational evolution on the lines of industrial progress, to be carried out in line with economic rather than political reasoning. While the pending bill is not compulsory it does give authority to the Interstate Commerce Commission to deny the unification unless the proposed system includes such road or roads as the commission deems necessary. The bill provides four methods of unification:

- (1) Where it is accomplished by one system taking over the physical properties of one or more other systems;
- (2) Where a corporate merger is permitted by one or more systems merging into the corporate control of an existing system;
- (3) Where a consolidation is effected by an entire new corporation created to absorb other systems which lose their existence; and
- (4) By the purchase of the securities of other roads.

The hope of the proponents of this constructive legislation is to insure an adequate transportation system operated by private enterprise under proper regulation in the interest of the public. It will be a definite announcement of a transportation policy which will enable freedom in management to proceed in improvements and betterments demanded by a rapidly growing locality, which will in time unlock resources and insure still greater prosperity to all our people.

"UNDER OUR FLAG"—LEAFLET BY IGNATIUS K. WERWINSKI

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, under House Joint Resolution 304 of the Seventieth Congress President Coolidge appointed Mr. Ignatius K. Werwinski, of South Bend, Ind., as a member of the Pulaski Sesquicentennial Commission. Mr. Werwinski has issued a leaflet entitled "Under Our Flag," and dedicated to the Sons of the Revolution. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the leaflet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNDER OUR FLAG

By Ignatius K. Werwinski, Lieutenant, Officers' Reserve Corps; also member of the United States Pulaski Sesquicentennial Commission by appointment of President Calvin Coolidge, under H. J. Res. 304, 70th Cong.

Under our flag, purest, most potent emblem of law, order, Christian civilization, that ever saluted the dawn, during the Revolutionary War, gave a life to a hero of two hemispheres, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Under our flag, ne'er dropped in dust of defeat, fostered by revered father of the Revolution, the name of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, is imperishably written in letters of gold on the pages of American history, defying the ages.

Under our flag, floating in zephyrs of high heaven o'er the eternal capital of a republic, founded on the rock of righteousness, symbol of humanity's fondest, dearest hope, forever proclaiming justice, human brotherhood throughout the land, through the inspirations left us by Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

Under our flag, unstained, untarnished, bejeweled, gleaming in darkest night, her triumphal march across the centuries a path of light. Who dare touch with profaning hand, this sleepless majestic guardian of an ardent, strong, brave, free people, and under which flag Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski gave his life in Savannah, Ga., on October 11, 1779.

Under our flag, inspiration of a mighty race, mingling in sentiment of cherished children, native of her soil undefiled, and lovers of liberty from every clime, seeking naught but the common good, yearning to serve mankind 'neath sheltering aegis of the red, white, and blue, under which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought.

Under our flag, immortalized by Washington, and under which flag fought Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, her beauteous folds spread from Gulf to Coast by Jefferson, borne aloft by Lincoln in strife of heroes that united as one a sisterhood of States and blended the blue and gray, in fires of patriotism, preserving every star in the shining standard of national sovereignty. May Old Glory, under which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought and gave his life, in all the flood of time wave with undimmed radiance and increasing splendor over the fairest expanse of God's earth.

Under our flag, precious, sublime inheritance, blessing of America's faith, power, unity, sanctified by patriot blood of our hero, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski. We consecrate anew in o'erflowing measure our hearts, our eager, willing service of hand and brain to the defense and greater glory to our country for which Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski fought and gave his life.

Under our flag may the American people pay the due tribute to the memory of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski on the one hundred and fiftieth

anniversary of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, Revolutionary War hero, by observing and commemorating the sesquicentennial anniversary of his death.

EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST ON BRAZIL'S GREAT PROGRESS

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President, as a striking evidence that the United States enjoys a feeling of confidence in and friendliness toward the various South and Central American Republics, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning entitled "Brazil's Great Progress." It is a splendid statement of the prosperous and happy conditions existing in that country.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 6, 1929]

BRAZIL'S GREAT PROGRESS

Americans are well pleased with the remarkable progress of Brazil, as set forth by President Washington Luis in his annual message to the Congress. His report of Government operations and national production and commerce during 1928 shows that Brazil is making rapid strides to the forefront of American republics, where it belongs by virtue of its immense natural wealth and its stable government.

During 1928 law and order were maintained, the budget balanced, a handsome surplus accumulated, foreign and internal debts reduced, the gold reserve doubled, currency convertible into gold increased, exports still further increased over imports, agricultural and industrial production increased, and public confidence in business, finance, and industry enhanced as a result of stabilization on a gold basis. Brazilian national bonds are rising in value. The country now produces 78 per cent of the world's coffee.

Each of these accomplishments, if it stood alone, would be creditable, but in the aggregate they constitute an almost unparalleled record of achievement. This record could not have been made without the earnest cooperation of an enlightened government and an industrious people. It furnishes proof that Brazil has found the road to permanent prosperity and peace. When the resources of that vast country are taken into account it becomes evident that within a few years Brazil will become one of the leading powers of the world.

Americans were deeply impressed by the manifestations of good will toward this country in Brazil's reception to Mr. Hoover. The relations between these giant Nations of South and North America are especially cordial, not only in consequence of the hospitality extended to the American President elect, but because the peoples recognize close similarities in the two countries. Both are possessed of immense area and matchless wealth awaiting development; both are firmly attached to the principle of government by the people; both seek friendly relations with their neighbors, and crave most of all an undisturbed opportunity to develop their own resources; both foresee a glorious future for which they must prepare by cultivating peace and commerce.

The progress of Brazil benefits and encourages other nations, besides contributing to the assurance of peace in this hemisphere. The United States rejoices in the rise of this great Republic in South America.

JEFFERSON DAY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR RANDELL

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very interesting and illuminating address delivered by our colleague, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL] at a banquet held on Jefferson Day in New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, as a Louisiana Democrat who has always been a protectionist I am delighted that the doctrine of protection for American products of factory and farm, taught forcibly by Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, the founders of the Democratic Party, was adopted in substance at the Houston convention and urged with much eloquence in last year's campaign by our great leader, Al Smith. Our platform plank on the tariff and Smith's construction of it indicated that the party has returned to the moorings of its first 40 years after nearly a century of free trade and tariff for revenue only, and great was the rejoicing thereof of many Democrats who, like myself, had felt almost strangers in their father's mansion.

It is a happy coincidence that as we gather here to pay homage to the memory of Thomas Jefferson the American Congress should be in special session to consider, in slightly different form, the very questions he helped to settle at the birth of this Republic. To the people of Louisiana Jefferson is the patron saint of Democracy, and in the language of a distinguished son of Massachusetts, they have always beheld his mighty figure coming down in history with the Declaration of Independence in one hand and the title deed of Louisiana in the other.

This special session of Congress has been called primarily to consider the farm situation in those States that were carved from the Louisiana Purchase. No better light could guide our footsteps than the policy of Jefferson, for he gave to this problem the same thought and logic that

have immortalized his doctrine dealing with the rights of man, religious liberty, and universal education.

Stripped of all subterfuge and simply stated, the remedy proposed by Jefferson for the ills of agriculture and industry alike was adequate protection.

In the heat of partisanship that raged throughout his long career it became the fashion of his opponents to deny him any part in the origin of the doctrine of protection. This school would date its birth from the Report on Manufactures prepared by Alexander Hamilton, the great leader opposed to Mr. Jefferson, in obedience to an order of the House of Representatives on January 15, 1790. But the first revenue act passed by the First Congress was signed by President Washington July 4, 1789—the previous year—and that act was the handiwork of James Madison, who, in its preparation, counseled with his mentor, personal and political friend, Thomas Jefferson. It was entitled "An act for laying a duty on goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States," and in its first section these words were used: "Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported," etc.

Nowhere will there be found a clearer exposition of Jefferson's views on protection than in his sixth annual message, wherein he said:

"Shall we suppress the impost and give that advantage to foreign over domestic manufactures? On a few articles of more general and necessary use the suppression in due season will doubtless be right, but the great mass of articles on which impost is paid is foreign luxuries, purchased by those only who are rich enough to afford themselves the use of them. Their patriotism would certainly prefer its continuance and application to the great purposes of the public education, roads, rivers, canals, and such other objects of public improvement as it may be thought proper to add to the constitutional enumeration of Federal powers."

In 1802 Jefferson said: "To cultivate peace, maintain commerce and navigation, to foster our fisheries, and protect manufactures adapted to our circumstances are the landmarks by which to guide ourselves in all our relations."

Jefferson's policy was continued by James Madison, who succeeded him as President. Madison had witnessed the decline of prosperity when our commerce was absolutely destroyed by the French on the one hand and the English on the other as a result of the Napoleonic wars. That he believed in protection as the quickest way to restore prosperity is clearly indicated in his special message to Congress in 1815, wherein he said: "There is no subject that can enter with greater force and merit into the deliberations than the consideration of the means to preserve and promote the manufactures which have sprung into existence and attained an unparalleled maturity throughout the United States during the period of the European wars. This source of national independence and wealth I anxiously recommend, therefore, to the prompt and constant guardianship of Congress."

In later years Madison was a staunch defender of that policy of protection which had inured to us a high place in the industrial life of the world. In 1828, 11 years after leaving the White House, when efforts were being made to create a party of opposition to the principle of protection, Madison rebuked the agitators in unequivocal terms, saying: "A further evidence of the constitutional power of Congress to protect and foster manufactures by regulations of trade (an evidence that ought itself to settle the question) is the uniform and practical sanction given to that power for near 40 years."

President Monroe was undoubtedly influenced by the opinions expressed by his predecessors in office and by the policy of protection which had prevailed uninterruptedly from the beginning of the Government. He seemed so well convinced that an abandonment of this policy would result disastrously to the public welfare that he departed from the customary course and referred to the subject in his inaugural address in 1817 by saying, "Our manufacturers will require the systematic and fostering aid of the Government." In his message to Congress in 1823 Mr. Monroe said:

"Having communicated my views to Congress at the commencement of the last session respecting the encouragement which ought to be given to our manufacture and the principle on which it should be founded, I have only to add that those views remain unchanged. I recommend a review of the tariff for the purpose of affording such additional protection to those articles which we are prepared to manufacture and which are immediately connected with the defense and independence of the country."

In the next presidential campaign all of the aspirants—John Quincy Adams, Jackson, Crawford, and Clay—based their candidacies in part on their support of Mr. Monroe's advocacy of additional protection. Four years later, when Jackson and Adams renewed their contest, the main issue was based on the question of protection. Old Hickory, who never left any doubt of where he stood, was particularly careful to make the American people acquainted with his record on this point, and the chairman of the Jackson Corresponding Committee in a ringing address not only criticized the sincerity of Jackson's opponents, Adams and

Clay, in their support of the doctrine of protection, but said in reference to the tariff bill of 1824, which was passed to give additional protection: "In every step of the progress of this bill before the Senate he [General Jackson] voted for it, and it is believed that without his aid it would not have passed." None of the declarations in favor of protection by our early chieftains were more explicit and direct than those of Andrew Jackson, victor in the Battle of New Orleans, and next to Jefferson, principal founder of the Democratic Party. His ideas on the tariff have always been regarded as good party doctrine by the sturdy Democracy of Louisiana, which was so devoted to your Al that it gave him a greater majority than any other State.

Thus in the light of recorded history credit for the doctrine of adequate protection belongs to Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson, who guided our Government in its infant days. Following their period were stormy years of political and economic strife. Our country gradually developed, its centers of agriculture and commerce shifted, and its national life became more complex. Out of the maelstrom of politics came the erroneous idea that as the policy of "free trade" had at various times subsequent to the eras of Jefferson and Jackson been associated with the Democratic Party its great founders were responsible for it. This charge is absolutely unjustified.

Owing to the peculiar nature of Louisiana's agriculture and industrial pursuits, the majority of its congressional delegation has always adhered to the Democratic principles of protection so forcibly and persistently advocated by the illustrious founders of the party. For many years we have been targets for shafts of criticism hurled from the Democratic side of the Senate and House, hence we are glad that our party has returned to the faith of its fathers, as demonstrated in the last presidential election.

No longer will the Louisiana delegation stand apart from Democratic ranks on tariff matters, for the doctrines of our founders are once more the guiding light of the party. The platform adopted at Houston last year reiterates our belief in adequate protection for American industries and agriculture. It stated that "the Democratic tariff legislation will be based on the following policies:

"(a) The maintenance of legitimate business and a high standard of wages for American labor.

"(b) Increasing the purchasing power of wages and income by the reduction of those monopolistic and extortionate tariff rates bestowed in payment of political debts.

"(c) Abolition of logrolling and restoration of the Wilson conception of a fact-finding Tariff Commission, quasi judicial and free from the Executive domination which has destroyed the usefulness of the present commission.

"(d) Duties that will permit effective competition, insure against monopoly, and at the same time produce a fair revenue for the support of Government. Actual difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, with adequate safeguard for the wage of the American laborer, must be the extreme measure of every tariff rate.

"(e) Safeguarding the public against monopoly created by special tariff favors.

"(f) Equitable distribution of the benefits and burdens of the tariff among all.

"(g) Wage earner, farmer, stockman, producer, and legitimate business in general have everything to gain from a Democratic tariff based on justice to all."

That platform was amplified and strengthened by Governor Smith in his Louisville speech during the campaign. On that occasion he displayed his ability to make clear and concise the problems which his opponents sought to shroud with intricacy and obscurity. In ringing words he rallied the party around his standard and gave to the Nation his idea of the tariff problem. He stated his belief in the nonpartisan aspect of the tariff and expressed the hope that it would be treated as a business and economic problem. In part he said that "the high wages and constructive policies established by Woodrow Wilson and the business prosperity resulting from them in America, coupled with the economic ruin of the rest of the world, brought about a new condition that committed the Democratic Party to a definite stand in favor of such tariff schedules as will to the very limit protect legitimate business enterprise as well as American labor from ruinous competition of foreign-made goods produced under conditions far below the American standard." He condemned the Republican policy of leaving the farmer outside our protective walls. "On import crops," the governor said, "the farmer must be given equal protection with that afforded industry. On his other products means must be adopted to give him, as well as industry, the benefit of tariff protection." In that brief sentence Al Smith summarized the fact that the Republican Party has posed as the friend of the farmer for decades, giving him nothing but sympathy, whereas under its régime industry has fared well. The farmer wants more than sympathy—he wants relief and is entitled to it. The products of the farm enter every home in the country and it therefore behooves every citizen to take a part in alleviating the distressing conditions of agriculture, which has been one of the basic pursuits of man since the time of Adam. Destroy your farms and your cities will die from dry rot. Under Jeffersonian supremacy, the farmer was on an equality with every other industry and his decline began with the

triumph of the Hamiltonian state. In the eyes of Jefferson, the American farmer held a position of paramount importance, but Hamilton's references to the tillers of the soil were few and of little significance. After many decades the position of this country's two great political parties remains the same—Governor Smith urged in his Omaha speech that the farmer "be given equal protection with that afforded industry," whereas leaders in the Republican ranks have, for the past seven or eight years, been fighting every proposition of a remedial nature for agriculture, and with the assistance of presidential vetoes, have succeeded in frustrating all efforts at farm relief.

Let no Democrat apologize for being a protectionist, for protection was the faith of our fathers. I have always been a firm believer in that doctrine, having introduced bills in the Senate for the protection of agricultural interests, as well as those in other lines of endeavor. A measure designed to protect the cotton farmers of the Nation against the free importation of jute, and furnish a larger market, is being sponsored by me at this time. As a farmer I appeal to the Democracy of New York to assist in solving the problems of agriculture. Let it not be said of us that promises alone have been our party's contribution to the solution of agricultural ills. Jefferson was the guiding light of Democracy in the early days of the Republic. Let his teachings lead us in the future under the standard of Governor Smith, who, after 25 years of public life, has shown us the error of our ways and led us back to the path of Jeffersonian principles.

ADDRESS BY DR. CHARLES H. MAYO ON "DANGER TO MAN OF BOVINE AND AVIAN TUBERCULOSIS" (S. DOC. NO. 7)

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document an address delivered by Dr. Charles H. Mayo, of Rochester, Minn., before the American Veterinary Medical Association at Minneapolis, Minn., August 9, 1928, on the subject Danger to Man of Bovine and Avian Tuberculosis, together with the bibliography that is annexed thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I simply wish to state that the law requires that a statement of the cost shall be attached to the application. Does the Senator know what the cost will be?

Mr. BLAINE. I do not know.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, in the case of an address from such an eminent source as this, I think it is perfectly proper to proceed; but that is the law. I have no objection, however.

INTERNATIONAL PAPER & POWER CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, some errors in names have been pointed out to me in the resolution which I submitted on Saturday last. I ask leave to modify the resolution and to offer a resolution by way of substitute for it, and I shall ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The substitute resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Whereas it appears from testimony taken by the Federal Trade Commission under and by virtue of Senate Resolution 83, Seventieth Congress, first session, that the International Paper & Power Co. and its affiliated concerns are the owners of stock in the Boston Herald and the Boston Traveler, published at Boston, Mass.; the Chicago Daily News, published at Chicago, Ill.; the Chicago Journal, published at Chicago, Ill.; the Tampa Tribune, published at Tampa, Fla.; the Greensboro Record, published at Greensboro, N. C.; the Knickerbocker Press, published at Albany, N. Y.; the Albany Evening News, published at Albany, N. Y.; the Brooklyn Eagle, published at Brooklyn, N. Y.; the Augusta Chronicle, published at Augusta, Ga.; the Columbia Record, published at Columbia, S. C.; the Spartanburg Herald and the Spartanburg Journal, published at Spartanburg, S. C.; and possibly other interests in other journals: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Postmaster General is hereby directed to transmit to the Senate for its information a copy of the last statement filed by the editor, publisher, business manager, or owner of each of the newspapers above enumerated, setting forth the names and post-office addresses of the editor and managing editor, publisher, business manager, and owners, and the stockholders, if the publication be owned by a corporation, and also the names of the known bondholders, mortgagees, or other security holders, as required by the act of Congress approved August 24, 1912.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. I understand the resolution is now before us under the rule. I should like to ask the Senator from Montana

why it is necessary for the Senate to pass a resolution to get information which is public property and which has to be published, if my recollection is correct, as an advertisement in certain newspapers whenever it is offered. Why can not the information be secured by writing to the Postmaster General? In other words, why should the Senate be asked to pass a resolution looking to this end?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I suppose any individual Senator who is interested in the matter could get the information in that way.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the Senator thinks he could get it by writing to the Postmaster General, why should the Senate be asked to pass a resolution to get it?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I want it for the information of the Senate, not for my own information.

Mr. BINGHAM. Could it not be used for the information of the Senate if the Senator got it in a more private manner?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Oh, I suppose so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I take it that the Postmaster General will report any other papers which may be in a like situation, under the clause in the resolution reading "and possibly other interests in other journals."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No; that refers to the ownership of the International Paper & Power Co. and requests only the statements with respect to the papers specifically mentioned.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. As I understand, the resolution simply asks for the information which the law requires the papers to furnish the Postmaster General.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. For copies of statements which the law requires shall be filed with the Postmaster General.

Mr. EDGE. I see no objection to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, is it necessary that the whereases be passed by the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That comes after the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. BINGHAM. Perhaps I am ignorant in the matter or not acquainted with the Senate precedents sufficiently, but I can not for the life of me see why the Senate should be asked to pass a resolution when the Senator who introduces it admits that he could get the information perfectly well without the resolution being passed by the Senate, when he could use it perfectly well in a speech and have it printed for the information of the Senate. There are a good many people in this country, not in any way concerned in this matter, who think that the Senate is a little too fond of passing resolutions casting some kind of an aspersion upon a business, and implying that the business is not as it should be.

I wish the Senator from Montana would give us some good reason why the Senate should pass this resolution when he has admitted that he could get the information perfectly well in another manner and could bring it to the attention of the Senate in another manner.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, aspersions have been cast by so many high-class newspapers in the country upon the particular transaction which gives rise to the resolution that I feel quite justified in myself casting whatever aspersion upon business is implied in the presentation of this resolution.

With respect to the other part of the question addressed to me by the Senator I beg leave to say that resolution after resolution is passed by the Senate of the United States asking the various departments for information which the authors of the resolutions requesting the information might get for their own information by writing to the departments.

This is a matter of public interest and public concern, as disclosed by the comment to which it has given rise all over the country. That is the reason why I want the information brought in a public manner to the Senate of the United States, so that if the law requiring the submission of certain information to the Postmaster General, which was enacted away back in 1912, does not meet the requirements of the case, the Senate may take appropriate action with respect to it by way of amendment or otherwise.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat will he tell us whether, in his opinion, the law as it now stands is not adequate to get the information which is necessary in a case of this kind?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have not given the subject sufficient study to answer the question.

Mr. BINGHAM. I wish before the Senator asks us to pass any resolution of this kind he would give the subject a little more study. He admits that he is willing to take upon himself any blame for casting an aspersion upon what apparently we have a right to think is an innocent business until it is proven guilty; yet he is not satisfied with that, but asks the Senate to cast an aspersion upon it.

I wish that it was not necessary for the Senate to pass resolutions of this kind. I suppose the resolution will be passed, because almost everybody says, "Let it go through. It will not do any harm. We could get the information anyway by writing." I wish the time would come when the Senate of the United States would not be held up to ridicule and scorn for passing resolutions of an unnecessary character.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I presume it is true that sometimes we pass resolutions which are unimportant, and think we can get along better by letting them go through without objecting. But I look upon this resolution as one of considerable importance, affecting a subject in which the public is interested, and, as was said by the Senator from Connecticut, some of the people do not know about it, but it is a matter which I hope more of the people will know something about, and this will have a tendency to bring them information in reference to it. It will bring the information to the Senate officially.

No aspersion would be cast upon any honest business by this resolution. We are asking for copies of affidavits of newspaper publishers which the law requires them to file with the Post Office Department. It may be that the information could be obtained in some other way, but that is no reason why we should not obtain it in this way. I like this way better than any other, perhaps for a different reason than that entertained by some Senators. For some time I have been thinking, and I know of other Senators who have been wondering, whether it is going to be necessary for Congress to change the law requiring the filing of affidavits of this kind. The object of the law is to give to the people and the readers of newspapers whatever facts there may be in relation to the ownership of the newspapers, in relation to the holding of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness of the newspapers.

I think everybody can see the point in that kind of law, and realize the usefulness of that kind of a law. It is so that the readers of a paper may know whether the paper is owned by some particular interest, not casting reflections upon anybody who owns a newspaper. If, in this case, the thing which has aroused public interest brings about the disclosure that large corporations engaged in the development, distribution, and sale of hydroelectric energy to the people are the owners of or have an indirect control of newspapers—through which the people must get their information as to public matters—and that by such ownership their interests would naturally incline such newspapers to lean in the direction, in public matters, in which these special interests might desire to have them lean; if it will enable the public to know whether such interests do own directly or control indirectly the means of communication by which the people of the country must obtain their information as to public affairs, I think it is well that we should have the information.

This would cast no aspersion on any honest ownership. There are those who believe that a great public utility corporation engaged in the business of developing, distributing, and selling electricity has, as a matter of business, no use for a newspaper along the lines of their business, and that when they go into the newspaper business, it may be with some ulterior motive. That is not charged in the resolution, but information as to the ownership of newspapers will have a tendency to show whether there is anything in it or not.

I know that many Members of Congress have been wondering whether our laws are sufficiently effective as to require the disclosure of the ownership of newspapers, or indirect control of newspapers, by the holding of mortgages and bonds. The law requires that certain disclosures be made—no one questions that law, or the object of it—so that the public may know whether any particular newspaper is likely to be controlled by some interested corporation engaged in the building up of sentiment favorable to the interest concerned. This matter comes up after disclosures that have shocked the conscience of all honest citizens have been made, brought about by the development of the investigation going on now before the Federal Trade Commission.

It seems to me that it is eminently proper that this resolution should be adopted by the Senate, and that we should show our interest in it by its adoption, and that this information, coming to us, which may aid us in any change which may seem desir-

able to have made in the law, should be given the widest publicity, and that we should get the information officially.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator will recall, perhaps, that some very interesting disclosures have been made by the Federal Trade Commission recently in regard to the Birmingham News, the Age-Herald, and the Montgomery Advertiser.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. I had something to say about that on the floor of the Senate some time ago.

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; I recall that.

Mr. NORRIS. And I am going to have something more to say about it a little later.

Mr. HEFLIN. I hope the Senator will. Does not the Senator think it would be well for Congress to pass a law providing that all of these big dailies that have interstate circulation should certify to the Government here who owns the paper, who the stockholders are, all of them, so that people will know who it is who is trying to mold public opinion in America?

Mr. NORRIS. Not only who the stockholders are, but the amount of stock owned by each one.

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; and to show who it is that is trying to mold public opinion and to defeat or promote legislation.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. NORRIS. In a moment I will yield. One of the objects, perhaps the primary object, of the law on the statute books requiring these affidavits to be filed by newspaper publishers, is that that very idea may be carried out.

As I look at it, every honest newspaper man engaged in the legitimate business of operating a newspaper hails with delight anything of that kind. He wants to have the public know; he does not want to have any law that will cover up facts, so that he may be classed with those who are trying surreptitiously to control, by all manner of means, the newspapers of the country.

Now I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the Senator evidently feels that the present law requiring the publication of the names of those owning stock and bonds in every publication using the mails is not adequate.

Mr. NORRIS. I would not say that. I will say frankly to the Senator that I do not know. One of the reasons why I favor the resolution is because I want to get some more information. I expect to make a study of the question. This is one step, and I think it will be a valuable step, in ascertaining what does really happen in carrying out the law and what are its practical effects. It may be that no amendment will be necessary. It may be that it will be found necessary. I am inclined to think that some amendment will be necessary, although at this time I have no idea what it should be or whether it should be at all.

Mr. BINGHAM. It would seem as though the resolution were intended to imply that the International Paper & Power Co. and its affiliated concerns had not acted in accordance with the law. So far as I understood from what the Senator from Montana said—and he will correct me if my understanding is not accurate—he desires to compare the last statements filed by the various newspapers with the testimony taken by the Federal Trade Commission. Is that correct?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator is quite correct, but he has not got the first proposition right. No report is required from the International Paper & Power Co. because it owns stock in a newspaper. The statement is made by the managing editor or the editor or some officer in charge of the paper and not by the stockholders.

Mr. BINGHAM. I understood that.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If there is a failure to comply with the law that can be charged against anybody, it will not be charged against the International Paper & Power Co. That may be some comfort to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator need not imply by innuendo or otherwise any comfort or discomfort which I may have in the matter. I am merely endeavoring to find out what the Senator is trying to do, and from a reading of the resolution it appeared to me the Senator was trying to prove that the newspapers had not complied with the law.

Mr. HEFLIN and Mr. VANDENBERG addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I want to yield to myself for a moment, and therefore I will not yield to anybody else for the time being.

The object is not necessarily to find out whether newspapers are complying with the law, as I am looking at the resolution. The object of it is to get the truth and the facts. It may be found upon examination that they are not complying with the law. It may be found that they have complied with the law, but that the law is insufficient and ought to be changed. In either case it will be beneficial to get vindication or otherwise of the law and its operation. It will be valuable information that the Senate and the country ought to have.

Mr. President, if the occurrence which has brought about the resolution and the power company which has purchased several newspapers were the only things that had happened, we might not pay so much attention to it, but it is only a part of the program that has been going on as the investigation shows and has been charged here in the Senate for several years. A gigantic trust is trying to control not only newspapers but every other means of communication by which sentiment can be built up favorable or unfavorable to this point of view or that point of view. So that, in my opinion, it seems to me the information is going to be of assistance to the Senate in deciding what steps, if any, ought to be taken.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, whatever view the distinguished Senator from Nebraska may take about the resolution, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], who introduced it, has admitted that his object was to find out whether the newspapers had reported the ownership of stock in the company by the International Paper & Power Co. If the Senator from Montana has any information from the public returns of those newspapers, which, I take it, must be published as soon as made, that that is the case and that they have not reported the ownership or the stock that is owned by the International Paper & Power Co., it seems to me it is the duty of the Senator from Montana to place the information in the hands of the district attorney or the Department of Justice and have a case brought in the proper court against the newspaper company and the matter settled in court as to whether the newspaper has been guilty or not of making false returns.

Seriously, it does not seem to me in accordance with old-fashioned ideas of American justice that we should pass a resolution implying that whereas it appears from testimony taken before a certain commission that a certain power company has stock in certain newspapers, and therefore we desire to know from the Postmaster General whether those newspapers have admitted the ownership of the stock or not. It seems to me that is not in accordance with the principles of fairness and justice on which the country has been founded for so long. It implies that newspapers are guilty.

The very introduction of the resolution, and asking that we pass it, implies that there has been some hocus-pocus going on, and, although I may be the only one that does so, I shall vote against the resolution because it includes the names of certain newspapers which are impliedly charged with failure to keep the law when there is no evidence before the Senate whatsoever that they have not complied with the law, and it tarnishes their good name. It seems to me, from my old-fashioned point of view, that the first thing to be done is for the Department of Justice to make the inquiry and not for the Senate of the United States to make the inquiry. If the Senator from Montana has any evidence that the newspapers in question have not complied with the law, it is his duty to place it in the hands of proper officials of justice, but not to ask us to pass a resolution of this kind.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from yield?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield the floor.

Mr. DILL. I want to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. BINGHAM. Very well.

Mr. DILL. What harm will be done by the facts asked for in the resolution being brought to the Senate? What injury will be done to anybody?

Then why object to the records being brought to the Senate?

Mr. BINGHAM. I have tried to make myself as clear as I could with the English language at my command. The reason why I object is that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] implies that certain citizens or corporations of the United States owning newspapers have broken a law, and he asks us to pass a resolution implying that they have broken the law, asking for evidence of whether they have broken it or not, by submitting certain matters to the Senate, which is not a court of justice.

Mr. DILL. But there is nothing in the resolution that says anything about anybody breaking the law. It simply asks for the information. What is there about it that implies that anyone has broken the law?

Mr. BINGHAM. The distinguished Senator from Washington is too good a lawyer and too keen a statesman to know that if there were not something that one could read between the lines there would be no necessity for the resolution, because the Senator from Montana has already admitted that he could get the information perfectly well by writing to the Postmaster General; that it is all a matter of public record and he could lay it before the Senate if he found or if some one in his office were asked to compare statements made by the different newspapers with statements made before the Federal Trade Commission and found material discrepancies. He would then have all the evidence he would need. He could put it in the hands of the Department of Justice.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator a question. We will assume they have not violated the law. We will suppose they have sworn to the truth and the facts are ascertainable from the Post Office Department.

Mr. BINGHAM. We must so assume.

Mr. McKELLAR. We must so assume. Could not the Senator well desire that the information be brought here in order to exonerate the newspapers, if he is interested in the newspapers?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am not interested in any of the newspapers or in the International Paper & Power Co. I am merely interested in old-fashioned American justice. But so crazy have we gone in our efforts to dig up matters that may or may not be of criminal intent that we insist on taking the time of the United States Senate to imply that people have broken the law instead of following the usual course of justice and putting the matter in the hands of the officers of justice in order that the parties may be investigated and if necessary brought to trial.

Originally we used to say that every man in the country was innocent until he was proven guilty, but now there is nothing to prevent us from casting aspersions in public on the floor of the United States Senate against any person or corporation against whom we desire to cast such aspersions. It seems to me the time has come, so far as I am concerned, to make a feeble protest against that sort of thing.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, speaking as one who has been in American journalism for a quarter of a century, I want to say, generally speaking, there is no group in American life with higher or more scrupulous ethical and patriotic standards than are found in the operation of American newspapers. I wish to say in addition that out of my familiarity with certain of the papers named in the preamble to this resolution I am perfectly sure that the relationship involved can not by any stretch of the imagination go to a control of policy or involve any untoward relationship. For that reason I should consider that it would be most unfortunate if any proposal for inquiry were to be stopped at this time.

Ventilation means vindication, or it means the disclosure of practices which 99 per cent of American journalism would condemn with all the vehemence of the distinguished Senators from Nebraska and Montana.

For the very reason of my faith in the newspaper profession, for the very reason of my confidence in those of my acquaintance who are named in the preamble, I hope the resolution will pass and that this or any kindred examination will be made as searching as possible. Truth never fears sunlight.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut talks about old-fashioned justice and the old-fashioned point of view. What he contends for here is not old-fashioned justice or an old-fashioned point of view in the newspaper business. The time was when we had editors everywhere who were conscientious, fearless, and able. They wrote exactly what they believed. They were planted in various sections of the country. They were in every State of the Union. Where is that old-fashioned editor to-day? With a few exceptions he is gone. Why is he gone? The predatory interests have appeared upon the scene, and when he has seen them moving steadily and surely upon the people, doing things that he knew were detrimental to their best interests, he dared to fight them. Then what did they do? They put up a newspaper right by his side and put the subscription price lower than his and put him out of business, bankrupted him. That is what has happened in various places.

I know, in the case of the Age-Herald in my State, the paper was a strong advocate of prohibition. Time was when it advocated prohibition and law enforcement. It was bought by some interests. I do not know exactly all of the interests that were in the deal. I have an idea and I think I shall know before the year is out. It changed front suddenly and it has been a wet paper ever since. It is advocating things right to the contrary of those which it advocated the day before the other people sold it.

That is what is going on in other parts of the country. A large portion of the press is no longer free. Anybody who is honest with himself and wants to be true to his country is bound to admit that fact. We have but few newspapers that are absolutely free. We have men who are free and some of them are in the press gallery of the Senate. But the country knows generally that a large portion of the press is subsidized, that it is owned by the big predatory and other dangerous interests of the Nation, and that they feed to the public exactly what they want the public to have and they keep from the public the things they do not want the public to have.

Those dangerous combinations are moving in practically every State in the Union. They are operating in my State to-day. They are seeking to flout their papers down there. They are trying to put out of business the papers that are asking for a fair deal for the people of the State who have business with the power companies, and the Federal Trade Commission is investigating that angle of the matter now. We can not do any harm by making these investigations. If these people are free of wrongdoing the investigation will disclose it. If they are guilty of wrongdoing the facts ought to be known.

This is still our country. But, Mr. President, how long will it be our country and a free country? If we stop investigations in the Senate, the last stronghold of liberty in the Nation, if we here prevent investigations of this kind, what will be the situation in 25 or 50 years from now, with some rich man in the East owning 50 daily newspapers in the country, and the same editorials, or practically the same, appearing in all of those newspapers at the same time, one man directing from some place of entrenched privilege the minds of the people and molding the public opinion of the greatest Government of all the world?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Alabama will allow me to remind him that relatively few people read editorials, and editorials do not have as much to do with the formation of public opinion as do the news items.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is true, I think; but my statement also applies to news items. They will not publish the news. Think of what happened here the other day! In the whole press gallery I have found but one newspaper, and that was the United States Daily, and I want to compliment it, that printed the resolution voted on in this body. It was a short resolution and anyone who wanted to be fair would have printed it and would also have printed the vote for and against it. The newspapers did not do it. Why? Because certain interests did not want that resolution to go out in the daily newspapers so that the people might read it. They did not want the vote to be read, and, therefore, the newspapers were silent as the tomb upon that also.

Mr. President, I do not care whether the news is favorable to me or against me; it makes no difference whatever with my individual course, because they can not stop me from doing my duty as I see it; but they ought to be fair and let the people know what transpires here—exactly what transpires here and not what they want to give out as having transpired. Some of the most garbled, misleading, and false reports that ever went out from here as to any matter went out in regard to what then occurred in the Senate. Still the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] believes in old-fashioned justice and wants to stand by the old-fashioned viewpoint, which would prevent an investigation.

Mr. President, the investigation proposed by the resolution ought to be made. Let the truth be known, and let us pass a law requiring the names of the stockholders of every big daily newspaper which has an interstate circulation to be made known and a public record to be made of the fact here; let us know exactly how much stock they have, and all about it, and who is directing the policy of the newspaper. That is something we can do toward preserving a free press in this great Nation of ours, and we can do it in time before it shall be everlastingly too late.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I can not agree to the opposition to this resolution which comes from the Senator from Connecticut. The resolution of the Senator from Montana asks for information which the public have a right to obtain. They have a right to know what is back of the ownership of the newspapers of the country. If there are publishers who oppose publicity of this information, they are few in number. I think I voice the overwhelming sentiment of the publishing fraternity when I say that we hope this resolution will be adopted.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] for presenting the pending resolution, and I want to say further that I disagree radically with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], who would have the Senator from Montana, or any other Senator who wants to obtain these facts, become a sort of personal detective and prosecutor in the effort to secure the information and lay it before the Department of Justice. In the light of these revelations, and in the light of the widespread discussion of the Power Trust influence on public opinion of America, it seems to me that anything that will throw more light upon this situation is desirable.

I think the activities of the great power organizations in trying to influence public opinion, as has been evidenced by the investigation of the Federal Trade Commission for the past year, show that it behooves everyone who would keep the sources of the public information free to do his part in limiting and controlling the tremendous power that is being built up by these great organizations of America.

I do not know—in my own mind I am not clear—just what steps Congress should take to protect the American people against the abuse of the use of money in influencing and creating public opinion, but I am sure that whatever can be done under the Constitution in harmony with American principles to protect the honest and free formation of public opinion should be done.

I hope the resolution will be adopted, and I hope the information called for by it will be forthcoming in the immediate future.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I very much hope that this resolution may be adopted. It certainly involves a matter in which the entire country is tremendously interested. It has been shown that it is very much interested by the wide publicity that has been given the fact that the International Paper Co., interested in power as well as in paper, has bought up an interest in many newspapers. For that reason a report ought to be had from the Postmaster General.

In addition to that, Mr. President, we have turned the matter of investigating the power interests over to the Federal Trade Commission. The information called for by the resolution should be a part of their report. We ought to uphold them; we ought to sustain them in every proper effort and endeavor. The newspapers to which attention has been called may not be the only newspapers which are owned by power companies in this country. Who knows? We do not know. We ought to go to the bottom of this matter, and wherever it is found that the newspapers in this country in fact, either through their bonds or by their stock, are owned by outside interests, and especially are owned by power interests, the American people should know it. We should know the sources through which public opinion is molded.

Mr. President, it has been suggested by the Senator from Connecticut that the preamble to the resolution ought to be stricken out. This is one resolution the preamble of which ought not to be stricken out, for it is a real part of the resolution and ought to be retained. I hope the Senator from Montana, who has done such splendid work in this and other matters concerning the public welfare of this country, will insist that the preamble remain in the resolution and that a report be submitted as called for in the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I expect to vote for the resolution; I shall be glad to do so; but the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], who has been called out of the Chamber, asked me if the resolution should come to a vote to make the point of no quorum. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Borah	Connally	Edge
Ashurst	Bratton	Copeland	Fess
Barkley	Brookhart	Couzens	Fletcher
Bingham	Broussard	Cutting	Frazier
Black	Burton	Dale	George
Blaine	Capper	Deneen	Gillett
Blease	Caraway	Dill	Glass

Glenn	Kean	Pine	Thomas, Idaho
Goff	Keyes	Pittman	Thomas, Okla.
Goldsbrough	King	Ransdell	Townsend
Greene	La Follette	Reed	Trammell
Hale	McKellar	Robinson, Ark.	Tydings
Harris	McMaster	Robinson, Ind.	Tyson
Harrison	McNary	Sackett	Vandenberg
Hastings	Metcalf	Schall	Wagner
Hatfield	Moses	Sheppard	Walcott
Hawes	Norbeck	Shortridge	Walsh, Mass.
Hayden	Norris	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Hebert	Nye	Smith	Warren
Hefflin	Oddie	Smoot	Waterman
Howell	Overman	Steck	Watson
Johnson	Patterson	Steiner	Wheeler
Jones	Phipps	Swanson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama tell us whether he thinks the garbled reports which were published and of which he complains and the failure of the newspapers to print his resolution in full were due to the ownership of the newspapers by the power companies?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not think the power companies had so much to do with it. I rather think that the Senator's friends at the Vatican had more to do with that than anybody else.

Mr. BINGHAM. I did not catch the Senator's statement.

Mr. HEFLIN. I referred to the Vatican.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana whether he would not be willing to let this resolution go over until he himself can secure from the Post Office Department the information in regard to the newspapers referred to? Surely it will not take more than a day to secure the reports; the information is public property, and it can be readily ascertained whether there is any evidence that the newspapers have not submitted proper reports.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think the matter has been fully considered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. I merely wish to ask, has there been any change in the resolution since it was originally submitted?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have presented a substitute for the original resolution merely to correct some errors in the designation of the names of the newspapers.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana tell us why he is not willing to follow that procedure?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator I will say that I think the matter has been fully considered. I have already answered the question. I have no personal interest at all in the matter. I am trying to discharge my duty as a representative of the people of the State of Montana.

Mr. BINGHAM. Has the Senator any information that there has been, in these returns, any concealment of ownership by the use of dummy directors or names that mean nothing?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The question is quite irrelevant. Some information has come to me that the reports are not accurate in all respects.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I hope very much that this resolution will not pass. As I said before, I have no interest whatever in any of these newspapers.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me long enough to ask for the reading of the modified resolution?

Mr. BINGHAM. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution, as modified, will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution, as modified.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, it is a matter of public record that the International Paper & Power Co. owns stock in these various newspapers, or has invested money in connection with the capital invested in these newspaper enterprises. Apparently, there is no question about that. I assume that that was given as a matter of testimony under oath before the Federal Trade Commission. Is that correct?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It is.

Mr. BINGHAM. The public, then, already knows officially that the International Paper & Power Co. has seen fit to invest part of its money in newspapers, evidently in the hope that these newspapers will buy their paper of this company, which, I understand, is chiefly engaged in making newsprint paper.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That may be the view taken by the Senator from Connecticut, and that is the view expressed by the

representatives of the International Paper & Power Co.; but the very general view prevails that their purpose is quite different.

Mr. BINGHAM. If it is found upon investigation that these newspapers, in making their returns as to stock issued, have not mentioned the name of the International Paper & Power Co., does the Senator think the implication is that they did not care to have it known that this company was interested in the particular newspaper concerned?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, the omission might be accidental; but if it was deliberate that would be the necessary inference, I should think.

Mr. BINGHAM. If it has been published that the International Paper & Power Co. did own this stock, does the Senator think that in itself is a sufficient reason to believe that his suspicions are correct that the reason for their owning this stock was an improper one and not that they hoped to have this company as a customer for their paper?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That, likewise, is quite irrelevant to the question as to whether the Senate should have this information or should not have the information. It is a matter of no consequence what I think about that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. What is the objection to obtaining the information called for by the resolution? Is it not the object of the statute to make available for the use of the public the information which this resolution asks?

Of course, the suggestion back of the resolution is that an effort is being made to control the source of information in so far as the interests of the power companies concerned are involved. It was to prevent just that sort of thing being done that the statute required the publication of the information sought by this resolution. I can not understand the basis of the Senator's opposition to giving the Senate the information which presumably the statute makes available for its consideration.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, was the Senator present when I stated my chief reasons for objecting to it?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; but the Senator from Arkansas was too obtuse to comprehend the statement of the able Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no, Mr. President; it was my fault for not making the point clear, because the Senator from Arkansas is never obtuse.

My objection, Mr. President, is this:

In the first place, I approve entirely of the statute, and think it was an excellent statute, and I hope it is being observed; but, if it is not being observed, I think the proper persons to investigate it are the members of the Department of Justice and the district attorneys, and not the Senate of the United States.

In the second place, the information is a matter of public record; and, furthermore, it must be published as an advertisement in the newspapers concerned whenever they are required by law to make it. There is no secrecy whatsoever about it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. If any newspaper neglects or refuses to observe the statute, is there any objection to the Senate ascertaining that fact?

Mr. BINGHAM. So far as we have heard, there is no charge whatever that any newspaper has neglected to publish this list. In fact, all that is called for in the resolution is that the Postmaster General send these lists to us.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That is in order that the Senate may have the information that the Postmaster General has by virtue of the statute. We do not get the information that is supplied under the statute unless we call for it.

Mr. BINGHAM. It has all been published in the newspapers. It is a matter of public record.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Yes; but neither the Senator from Connecticut nor any other Senator has seen it, and in all probability he would have great difficulty in collecting it.

Mr. BINGHAM. But the subscribers to the newspaper, who are the persons most concerned, see that statement whenever it is made. They must know whether the statement made before the Federal Trade Commission that the International Paper & Power Co. owns stock in that paper has been published in its advertisements or not.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I will not contribute further to the manifest design of the Senator to prolong the debate until the hour of 2 o'clock.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the Senator for the implication that I can talk for 20 minutes longer. I have no desire to prolong the debate; but I desired and was about to answer the

question which the Senator asked me, and I had only gotten two-thirds of the way through when the Senator rose and made his facetious remark.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And asked the Senator another one.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator did me the honor to ask why it was that I objected. I gave him two of the reasons. The third reason is the one that seems to me the most important. The Senator knows perfectly well that this information could be obtained by the Senator from Montana or by the Senator from Arkansas by the mere process of writing a letter asking the Postmaster General to give him that information and within 24 hours he would receive it and could present it to the Senate.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not know whether that is true or not.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator from Montana admitted that that was true.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Postmaster General might extend that courtesy to the Senator from Montana. I assume that he would do so.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator from Montana said he had no doubt he could get the information in that way.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I assume that the Postmaster General would answer a letter addressed to him by the Senator from Montana; but if the Senate desires information for its use it certainly is not inappropriate to ask for it and to procure it by resolution; and what difference can it make to the Senator from Connecticut? The resolution merely seeks to obtain information. Why does the Senator object to the Senate having information? Is it not true that we need it?

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no objection to the Senate getting the information; and if the Senator from Montana will write a letter to the Postmaster General asking him for the information, if there is any delay in his receiving the information I shall then be very glad to vote for the resolution. But until he does so, until there is some showing that the Postmaster General is endeavoring to conceal it, I do not see why the names of certain good newspapers throughout the country should be put into the "whereases" which we are asked to pass upon in a resolution, implying that they are not making a fair and honest return, but that they are making a false return, and that we must have those returns before us to see whether they conform to the returns made before the Federal Trade Commission in the testimony which has been referred to.

That is why I object to the resolution. It is not that there is anything in the information that anybody ought not to have. It is all a matter of public interest, anyway. It is because the Senator from Montana, instead of doing it himself, wishes to get the Senate of the United States to imply that these newspapers have not made a proper return, and that we had better see what kind of return they have made, and see whether or not it checks up with the information that was given to the Federal Trade Commission. That is why I object to it.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do.

Mr. EDGE. Does it occur to the Senator, in view of the questions that have been raised in this debate, and to some extent the doubts that have been expressed, that it would be all the fairer to the newspapers to pass this resolution at this time, in order that it could not be inferred that there was any objection to giving the greatest amount of publicity to the financial reports already made? Does not the Senator believe that the situation in which we are placed now is one that demands that the resolution shall be passed, I repeat, in fairness to the newspapers concerned?

Mr. BINGHAM. That was the position taken by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the most distinguished journalist on the floor.

Mr. EDGE. I refuse to enter into that argument, Mr. President. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, that raises a new issue.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not think that statement ought to pass unchallenged in the absence of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. [Laughter.]

Mr. BINGHAM. There are others here whom I see who might readily believe that their journalistic efforts—or at least their efforts to produce material for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—led them to a superior plane from the Senator from Michigan. [Laughter.]

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope there will be no investigation of that particular phase of the problem, at any rate.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, it is quite evident from the question propounded by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr.

EDGE] and from the position taken by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] that they believe that we would be doing an injustice to the newspapers concerned if this resolution were delayed and were not immediately passed. I regret that that is so, because it seems to me the kind of resolution which we should not pass, one of those utterly useless public gestures intended to procure publicity and acclaim from a certain section of the public. I do not see why we have to pass that kind of resolution; but since the matter has gone so far, and since it might appear that if the resolution did not pass we were endeavoring to conceal something, and since it appears now that it would be an advantage to these newspapers to have this matter cleared up at once, I shall withdraw all objection to it, although I know very well it is not the kind of resolution we ought to pass, and I shall vote against it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the preamble as modified.

The preamble as modified was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL PATRONAGE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the following resolution coming over from a previous day, which the clerk will report.

The resolution (S. Res. 42), submitted by Mr. GEORGE April 25, 1929, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the investigation authorized and directed by Senate Resolution 193, Seventieth Congress, as modified by Senate Resolution 330, Seventieth Congress, relating to Federal appointments, shall be continued and completed by the Senators appointed as a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads for the purposes of such investigation, notwithstanding any changes in the membership of such committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia will permit a question, may I ask if the resolution is satisfactory to the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I desire to say that when the resolution was offered, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. BLEASE] objected. Subsequently he withdrew his objection. I submitted the matter to the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. I wish to state that that committee is now investigating not merely post offices but all Federal offices, while originally the investigation was confined to postal matters. I did consult the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and from the last statement he made to me I understood that he acquiesced in the passage of the resolution. If the Senator will permit the resolution to go through, and the chairman of that committee wishes to lodge a motion for a reconsideration, I will agree to it.

Mr. REED. That is all I could ask.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE RULES—OPEN EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, some time ago I made a motion to amend Rule XXXVIII, and I requested, when the resolution went over, that it might retain its position without prejudice. Apparently it has been laid on the table. I ask that it be restored to its original place and that it may go over without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state to the Senator from Washington that the RECORD shows that the request was made by him and that the request was acceded to. If the calendar shows otherwise, it will be changed.

Mr. JONES. My request just made is granted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

TAX REFUNDS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we all remember the question of tax refunds so actively fought over at the last session. It will be recalled that an amendment offered by me to the deficiency appropriation bill was adopted after it had been changed a great deal. However, it did provide for a public statement to be made about every tax refund. The first reports of the Bureau of Internal Revenue under the amendment are before us, and I ask unanimous consent that these reports, together with a letter from Mr. Parker, be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

It will be seen from these reports that only about \$6,000,000 in claims of more than \$20,000 have been refunded in a period

of more than six weeks. At this rate refunds in claims of \$20,000 or more will not amount to more than \$50,000,000 a year. I am informed that these large refunds constitute more than three-fourths of the entire refunds. When we recall the enormous sums heretofore paid out in refunds amounting to more than \$200,000,000 per year, it looks as if the amendment insisted upon and passed by the Senate will save to the Government an enormous amount of money each year. It will be noted that of the \$6,000,000 refunded, credited, or abated, as shown in the reports, more than \$4,600,000 was refunded to one estate at the end of a lawsuit.

I am very happy to make this report to the Senate. It shows the necessity of the legislation that was passed by Congress at the last session. I hope the statement of facts may hereafter be a little more full in the cases which have not been before the courts.

I also ask to insert in the RECORD the amendment as it was adopted, the Secretary's regulations of March 14, 1929, and the President's order of the same date.

I take this occasion to commend President Hoover for his order in the matter of these refunds. I would be glad to commend the Secretary also but I can not, because I recall that he wrote a number of letters against the amendment on which the regulation was based. I have noted with some amusement the studied effort upon the part of the Secretary not to refer to the law on which the regulation is really based. It would seem from the reports that very little of the deficiency appropriation of \$75,000,000 will be used—

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does the request include the Executive order of the President?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have included the Executive order, the statute as amended, and the order of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The matter referred to is as follows:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,

Washington, May 4, 1929.

Hon. KENNETH McKELLAR,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In accordance with your request I am attaching hereto copies of all the decisions of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in refund, credit, or abatement cases of over \$20,000 each, issued from March 14, 1929, up to to-day. The decisions in these cases are public pursuant to the Executive order of the President dated March 14, 1929, and Treasury Decision No. 3858, amended, issued on the same date. A copy of the order and the amended Treasury decision are also attached.

The total amount of refunds, credits, and abatements, and the interest and costs thereon, may be summarized as follows for the 13 decisions made public up to date—

Total refunds.....	\$5,457,552.40
Total credits.....	256,983.56
Total abatements.....	212,196.49
Total interests and costs.....	84,921.15
Grand total.....	6,011,653.60

Very respectfully,

L. H. PARKER.

Decision No. 1

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

April 20, 1929.

In re: Estate of William Waldorf Astor, the Farmers Loan & Trust Co., trustee, New York, N. Y.

An overassessment of estate tax in favor of the above-named taxpayer is determined in the amount of \$4,635,530.49.

The entire above overassessment is due to a decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in the case of this taxpayer (Farmers Loan & Trust Co., Trustee, v. Bowers, 29 Fed. (2), 14).

D. H. BLAIR, Commissioner.

Refunded, \$4,635,530.49.

Decision No. 2

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

April 16, 1929.

In re: The Hoffheimer Bros. Co., Cincinnati, Ohio.

An overassessment of income and excess-profits taxes in favor of the above-named taxpayer is determined as follows:

Fiscal year ended June 30, 1918, overassessment..... \$62,597.58

The entire above overassessment is due to a decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in the case of this taxpayer for the year involved (*Dean v. The Hoffhelmer Bros. Co.*, 29 Fed. (2d) 668).

D. H. BLAIR, *Commissioner*.

June 30, 1918, refund, \$51,468.74; interest, \$11,116.54; costs, \$12.30.

Decision No. 3

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

April 16, 1929.

In re: Trust Co. of Georgia, Atlanta, Ga.

An overassessment of income and profits taxes in favor of the above-named taxpayer is determined as follows:

Year 1919, overassessment..... \$259,097.93

The entire above overassessment is due to the decision of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth District in the case of this taxpayer for the year involved (*Rose v. Trust Co. of Georgia*, 28 Fed. (2d) 767).

D. H. BLAIR, *Commissioner*.

1919, refund, \$199,258.53; interest, \$59,827.80; costs, \$11.60.

Decision No. 4

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

April 16, 1929.

In re: Barker Bros. (Inc.), Los Angeles, Calif.

Overassessments of income and profits taxes in favor of the above-named taxpayer are determined as follows:

Year:	Overassessment
1917.....	\$17,365.04
1918.....	25,188.44

The entire above overassessments are due to a decision of the United States District Court for the Southern District of California in the case of this taxpayer for the above years (*Barker Bros. (Inc.) v. Carter*, unreported).

D. H. BLAIR, *Commissioner*.

1917, refund, \$12,171.76; 1918, refund, \$17,684.67; 1917 and 1918, interest, \$12,697.05.

Decision No. 5

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

April 16, 1929.

In re: Fisk Rubber Co., New York, N. Y.

An overassessment of income and profits taxes in favor of the above-named taxpayer is determined as follows:

Year 1920, overassessment..... \$216,269.90

A hearing was held June 15, 1928.

The entire overassessment is caused by a reduction in the inventory valuation as of December 31, 1920.

After thorough and extensive examinations of the taxpayer's books of accounts and records by field examiners and conference held in the bureau it is determined that the inventory valuation as at December 31, 1920, was materially overstated in the tax return. In the present audit the same inventory valuation is used as at that date as was used for the opening inventory in the prior audit of the case for the year 1921, and which was stipulated and approved by the United States Board of Tax Appeals for that year, Docket No. 15840.

D. H. BLAIR, *Commissioner*.

Year 1920, credited, \$105,548.69; refund, \$110,721.21.

Decision No. 6

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

April 16, 1929.

In re: P. Lorillard & Co., New York, N. Y.

An overassessment of income and profits taxes in favor of the above-named taxpayer is determined as follows:

Year 1920, overassessment..... \$236,554.93

A hearing was held June 15, 1927.

Of the above overassessment \$235,828.71 is caused by an increase to the inventory value as of July 1, 1920, as reported by the taxpayer in its income and profits tax return filed for the year 1920. The increase in value has been allowed after thorough examinations of the taxpayer's books and records and conference in the bureau and is consistent with the increase in inventory value as at December 31, 1919, used in determining a deficiency in tax for that year.

The balance of the above overassessment in the amount of \$726.22 is caused by a deduction from the reported income representing the depreciated cost of a capital asset permanently discarded during the taxable year. Section 234 (a) (4) of the revenue act of 1918; article 142 of regulations 45: Appeal of King Lumber & Oil Co., 4 B. T. A. 1253.

The foregoing adjustments are made in accordance with a stipulation approved by the United States Board of Tax Appeals in the instant case, Docket No. 24434.

D. H. BLAIR, *Commissioner*.

Year 1920, credited, \$85,002.88; refunded, \$151,552.05.

Decision No. 7

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

April 18, 1929.

In re: Dallas Brass & Copper Co., Chicago, Ill.

An overassessment of income and profits taxes in favor of the above-named taxpayer is determined as follows:

Year 1918, overassessment..... \$31,212.49

A hearing was held December 29, 1927.

The entire overassessment is caused by a redetermination of the profits tax liability under the provisions of sections 327 and 328 of the revenue act of 1918, due to the existence of abnormal conditions affecting the taxpayer's capital and income to the extent that if the profits tax were computed without the benefit of such sections it would work upon the taxpayer an exceptional hardship evidenced by gross disproportion between the tax so computed without the benefit of section 327 of the revenue act of 1918 and the tax computed by reference to representative corporations specified in section 328. Section 327 (d), revenue act of 1918: Appeals of Davis and Andrews Co., 2 B. T. A. 328; E. B. Ficklen Tobacco Co., 10 B. T. A. 51.

The present determination of the profits tax liability, as above, is in accordance with a stipulation approved by the United States Board of Tax Appeals in the instant case, docket No. 2629.

D. H. BLAIR, *Commissioner*.

Year 1918, abated, \$31,212.49.

Decision No. 8

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

April 25, 1929.

In re: Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., Minneapolis, Minn.

An overassessment of income tax in favor of the above-named taxpayer is determined as follows:

Year 1920, overassessment..... \$178,076.28

A hearing was held March 21, 1929.

The overassessment is caused by the following adjustments:

Guaranty period settlement: Reduction of the income reported in the return filed, representing amounts claimed by the taxpayer from the Federal Government for the six months "guaranty period" immediately following their release from Government control on March 1, 1920, by the excess of such amounts over the actual settlement made by the Government in a later year, causes \$117,334.56 of the overassessment. This adjustment is made in accordance with the provisions of S. M. 2970 (C. B. IV.-1, 127), inasmuch as the taxpayer reported its income on the accrual basis and it accepted the provisions of section 209 of the transportation act of 1920.

Accrued liability: Allowance of a deduction from the reported income for a liability incurred in 1920, but the exact amount of which was not finally determined until a subsequent year, results in \$50,805.16 of the overassessment. Proper adjustment has been made in the audit of the return filed for the year in which settlement was made. Article III of Regulations 45; appeal of Producers Fuel Co., 1 B. T. A. 202.

Amortization of bond discount: The balance of the overassessment, amounting to \$9,936.56, is caused by the allowance of an increased deduction for amortization of discount on bonds maturing serially, computed in accordance with the provisions of G. C. M. 3832 (C. B. VII.-1, 123).

D. H. BLAIR, *Commissioner*.

Year 1920, credited, \$66,431.99; refunded, \$111,644.29.

Decision No. 9

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,

April 20, 1929.

In re: H. K. Knopf, 3576 Beechwood Boulevard, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Overassessments of income taxes, penalties, and interest in favor of the above-named taxpayer are determined as follows:

Year:	Overassessment
1920.....	\$57,139.08
1921.....	19,373.82
1922.....	7,327.31
1923.....	6,891.12
1924.....	9,581.09

A hearing was held January 21, 1929.

Jeopardy assessments of additional taxes for the above years were previously made under the provisions of section 279 (a) of the revenue act of 1926 in amounts sufficient to protect the Government's interests, and were based on the best information available at that time. The taxpayer in due course filed an appeal with the United States Board of Tax Appeals from such assessments. Thereafter thorough and extensive examinations of the taxpayer's books of accounts and records and other relevant data were made by field examiners and conferences were held in the bureau for the purpose of considering allegations made by the taxpayer, of errors committed in the determination of the income upon which the jeopardy assessments were based. Pursuant to such investigations deductions to which the taxpayer was entitled were allowed and the resultant tax liability was made the subject of a stipulation which was approved by the Board of Tax Appeals, Docket No. 21642.

The overassessments result from the following causes:

Contract profits: Allowance of deductions for expenses paid in connection with certain contracts, which expenses were estimated in the prior audit causes \$9,899.74 of the above overassessment. Section 214 (a) (1) revenue acts of 1918, 1921, and 1924.

Unidentified income: Unexplained bank deposits added to the taxpayer's reported income in the prior audit are reduced by the amounts which investigation discloses do not constitute taxable income, resulting in \$33,070.22 of the above overassessment.

Commissions: Of the overassessment \$8,100.40 is caused by the allowance of deductions for commissions paid by the taxpayer since such amounts represent ordinary and necessary business expenses as contemplated by section 214 (a) (1) of the revenue acts of 1918, 1921, and 1924.

Losses: Of the overassessment \$5,347.44 is due to the allowance of losses deductible under the provisions of sections 214 (a) (4) of the revenue acts of 1918, 1921, and 1924 and the regulations promulgated thereunder. These losses were sustained from sales of securities, operation of a farm as a business enterprise, and on the sale of an automobile used for business purposes.

Overstatement of salaries: Of the total overassessment \$766.84 is due to the reduction of salaries received reported as income in the return since investigation discloses the amounts of such salaries were overstated.

Miscellaneous: Minor adjustments cause \$378.26 of the overassessment.

Credits: Of the overassessment \$8,262.33 is attributable to the allowance in computing the normal tax of credits for dividends received from domestic corporations and interest received from obligations of the United States subject to surtax only as provided by section 216 of the revenue acts of 1918, 1921, and 1924.

Penalties and interest: Ad valorem penalties based on the deficiencies in tax for each of the years involved together with interest for the years 1920 and 1924 were assessed at the same time the deficiencies in tax were assessed and determination of overassessments in tax causes a proportionate reduction in penalties and interest.

Year:	Abated
1920	\$57,139.08
1921	19,373.82
1922	7,327.31
1923	6,891.12
1924	9,581.09

D. H. BLAIR, Commissioner.

Decision No. 10

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
April 16, 1929.

In re: Estate of Frederic B. Jennings, Laura H. Jennings, executrix, New York, N. Y.

An overassessment of income tax in favor of the above-named estate is determined as follows:

Year 1919, overassessment.....\$46,287.04

A hearing was held April 20, 1926.

The entire above overassessment is due to the following cause:

The individual income-tax return of Frederic B. Jennings for the calendar year 1919 was filed on March 15, 1920. A deficiency in tax of \$46,287.04 assessed during May, 1924, was paid on July 30, 1925. A formal claim for refund of the deficiency in tax payment was filed on September 19, 1925.

The 5-year period for collection of 1919 taxes as provided by section 250 (d) of the revenue act of 1918 expired March 15, 1925, and since the assessment, although made within the statutory period, was made prior to the enactment of the revenue act of 1924, the period for collection was not extended by section 278 (d) thereof. *Russell v. United States* (49 Sup. Ct. 121). No claim for the abatement of the deficiency in tax having been filed by the taxpayer the \$46,287.04 represents an overpayment within the provisions of sections 607 of the revenue act of 1928.

D. H. BLAIR, Commissioner.

Year 1919, refunded, \$46,287.04.

Decision No. 11

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
April 16, 1929.

In re: Spring Brook Water Supply Co., care of Federal Water Service Corporation, New York, N. Y.

Overassessments of income taxes in favor of the above-named taxpayer are determined as follows:

Year:	Overassessment
1923	\$18,407.79
1924	18,594.08
1925	20,149.02

A hearing was held June 26, 1928.

The overassessments are caused by the allowance of additional deductions for depreciation and by allowance of a loss of a subsidiary corporation in determining consolidated net income.

Of the above overassessments \$57,111.17 is caused by the allowance of additional deductions for depreciation for each of the years set forth above since the deductions claimed in the returns as filed were inadequate. This conclusion has been reached after thorough and extensive investigations of the taxpayer's books of accounts and records by field examiners and conferences held in the bureau. After consideration of all relevant facts and circumstances, such as a proper classification of the depreciable properties, establishment of time of acquisition, and estimated useful life, reasonable allowances for depreciation have been allowed as provided by section 234 of the revenue acts of 1921, 1924, and 1926 and the regulations promulgated thereunder. *Appeal Even Realty Co., 1 B. T. A. 355.*

The balance of the overassessments amounting to \$39.72 results from deducting a loss of an affiliated corporation.

D. H. BLAIR, Commissioner.

Year:	Refunded
1923	\$18,407.79
1924	18,594.08
1925	20,149.02

Decision No. 12

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
April 22, 1929.

In re: Estate of Simon L. Bloch, Bernhard Bloch, and Arthur Bloch, Executors, Philadelphia, Pa.

An overassessment of estate tax in favor of the above-named taxpayer is determined in the amount of \$64,082.73.

The entire overassessment is due to a decision of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the case of this taxpayer (*Bernhard R. Bloch, et al. v. McCaughn*, unreported).

D. H. BLAIR, Commissioner.

Refund	\$64,082.73
Additional interest	1,255.86
Total refunded	65,338.59

Decision No. 13

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
April 20, 1929.

In re: Weill-Jamison Co. (Inc.), New York, N. Y.

Overassessments of income and profits taxes in favor of the above-named taxpayer are determined as follows:

Year:	Overassessment
Year 1919	\$30,984.44
Period ended May 31, 1920	49,687.14

The entire above overassessments are allowed pursuant to a decision of the United States Board of Tax Appeals in the instant case, reported at 13 B. T. A. 1342.

D. H. BLAIR, Commissioner.

Year:	Abated
1919	\$30,984.44
1920	49,687.14

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Refunding taxes illegally collected: For an additional amount for refunding taxes illegally or erroneously collected, as provided by law, including the payment of claims for the fiscal year 1929 and prior years, \$75,000,000: *Provided*, That a report shall be made to Congress by internal-revenue districts, and alphabetically arranged, of all disbursements hereunder in excess of \$500 as required by section 3 of the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 996), including the names of all persons and corporations to whom such payments are made, together with the amount paid to each: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used to pay any refund of an income or profits tax pursuant to a claim allowed after the enactment of this act in excess of \$20,000 (other than payments in cases in which a suit in court or a

proceeding before the Board of Tax Appeals has been or shall be instituted or payments in cases determined upon precedents established in decisions of courts or the Board of Tax Appeals) unless a hearing has been held before a committee or official of the Bureau of Internal Revenue; and the decision of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in any such refund allowances in excess of \$20,000 shall be a public record.

(T. D. 4264)

Amending T. D. 3856, publication of internal revenue tax refund decisions

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C.

To collectors of internal revenue and others concerned:

T. D. 3856, as amended (being regulations prescribed by the Secretary and approved by the President and applicable to the inspection of returns under the revenue act of 1928 and prior revenue acts), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"20. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall cause to be prepared a written decision in every case in which an overassessment (whether resulting in a refund, credit, or abatement) of an income, war-profits, excess-profits, estate, or gift tax is allowed in excess of \$20,000, and such decision shall be considered a public record and shall be open to inspection, during regular hours of business, in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or such office as he may designate. Such decision shall give the amount of the overassessment and shall be accompanied by a brief summary of the relevant facts and a citation of the authorities applicable thereto, or, in a case in which a decision of a court or of the Board of Tax Appeals has become final, by a citation of the court or board decision. Under no circumstances shall the provisions of this paragraph be construed as making any return, or any part thereof, open to inspection, or as authorizing the source of any income, gains, or profits, or the specific transactions resulting in losses or expenditures, to be made public; nor shall any of the information contained in any return or relating thereto be made public except in accordance with and to the extent necessary in carrying out these regulations."

A. W. MELLON,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Approved March 14, 1929.

HERBERT HOOVER,
The White House.

EXECUTIVE ORDER—PUBLICATION OF INTERNAL REVENUE TAX-REFUND DECISIONS

Pursuant to the provisions of section 55 of the revenue act of 1928 and section 257 of the revenue act of 1926, it is hereby ordered that decisions of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue allowing a refund, credit, or abatement of income, war-profits, excess-profits, estate, or gift taxes in excess of \$20,000 shall be open to inspection in accordance and upon compliance with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and approved by me bearing even date herewith.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 14, 1929.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll. The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fletcher	King	Shortridge
Ashurst	Frazier	La Follette	Simmons
Barkley	George	McKellar	Smith
Bingham	Gillett	McMaster	Smoot
Black	Glass	McNary	Steck
Blaine	Glenn	Metcalf	Stetwer
Blease	Goff	Moses	Swanson
Borah	Goldsbrough	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Greene	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Hale	Nye	Townsend
Broussard	Harris	Oddie	Trammell
Burton	Harrison	Overman	Tydings
Capper	Hastings	Patterson	Tyson
Caraway	Hatfield	Philpps	Vandenberg
Connally	Hawes	Pine	Wagner
Copeland	Hayden	Pittman	Walcott
Couzens	Hebert	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Heflin	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	Warren
Duncan	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	Warner
Dill	Jones	Sackett	Watson
Edge	Kean	Schall	Wheeler
Fess	Keyes	Sheppard	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The clerk will report the first number on the calendar.

CHANGE OF DATE OF INAUGURATION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, fixing the commencement

of the terms of President and Vice President and Members of Congress, and fixing the time of the assembling of Congress, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 2, line 3, to strike out "2d" and insert in lieu thereof "15th"; in line 5, to strike out "15th" and insert in lieu thereof "2d"; in line 18, to strike out the words "where the Vice President has not been chosen" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "of the failure to choose the Vice President"; and in line 20, after the word "shall," insert the word "then," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment of the Constitution be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid as a part of said Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of the several States as provided by the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The terms of the President and Vice President shall end at noon on the 15th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 2d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 2d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

"SEC. 3. If the House of Representatives has not chosen a President, whenever the right of choice devolves upon them, before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, then the Vice President shall act as President, as in the case of the death or other constitutional disability of the President. The Congress shall by law provide for the case of the failure to choose the Vice President before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly until the House of Representatives chooses a President or until the Senate chooses a Vice President.

"SEC. 4. This amendment shall take effect on the 15th day of October after its ratification."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, inasmuch as this is the same resolution that was amended by the Judiciary Committee, is in the exact form in which we passed it at the last session, and is in practically the same form in which it has been passed four times, I am wondering if the Senate is not ready to vote on it.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I understand that the House of Representatives is not going to consider any matter at this extra session of Congress except the tariff and the farm relief bill. If that be true, I can not see the necessity of sending over there matters which they have killed time and time again.

I am opposed to the joint resolution myself. I voted against it before, and I shall vote against it every time it comes before us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

FARM RELIEF

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1) to establish a Federal farm board to aid in the orderly marketing, and in the control and disposition of the surplus, of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] to strike out section 10 as amended.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, apropos of the pending farm relief bill, I wish to suggest that the preservation of forests and the reforestation of our vast areas of cut-over timberlands is a farm problem of supreme importance. Trees are products of the farm just as are other things produced by the soil, the difference being that ordinary crops are planted, attain full growth, and are harvested within 12 months, whereas trees require many years to attain maturity. There is no more beautiful object in nature than a tree, and none more worthy of being preserved. Trees give great delight to the beholder; they are the homes of birds and innumerable insects; they protect us from the summer's heat; and they furnish lumber for our houses, and fuel for fire. The uses of trees are innumerable and the earth would be truly barren and sterile if deprived of them.

Just how the wise use of our forests and their reproduction, so as to furnish a continuous growth forever, is connected with the pending bill, I shall not discuss at this time, but the relationship is close and should be considered with great care by all true friends of agriculture.

Primitive man regarded forests as obstructions to his agricultural pursuits because they covered the ground and prevented its cultivation. Reforestation and ordinary farming are kindred

pursuits in many respects, though differing in very important particulars. The problems of reforestation are manifold and the most complex thereof is taxation. Congress has sensed the seriousness of this situation and taken steps to assist in solving it.

At the recent meeting of the Southern Forestry Congress held in the city of New Orleans on the 5th of last month, I delivered a carefully prepared address entitled "Reforestation or Deforestation," which I ask to have printed at the close of my remarks as an exhibit thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.
(See Exhibit A.)

Mr. RANSEDELL. Mr. President, in the preparation of this address I was aided by a number of thoughtful, intelligent men, among others Hon. Henry E. Hardtner, president of the Urania Lumber Co., Urania, La. He is one of the most prominent lumbermen and economists in the Nation, and is regarded by many as the father of reforestation in the South. His vision and enterprise have caused Louisiana to assume leadership in forestry practice, and its citizens are proud of his accomplishments. I ask to have printed in the RECORD extracts from Mr. Hardtner's letters to me dated February 4 and 28 last, in which great stress is laid upon the subject of taxation of forest lands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The extracts referred to are as follows:

[Extracts from letter dated February 4, 1929, from Hon. Henry E. Hardtner, of Urania, La., to Senator JOSEPH E. RANSEDELL]

Local taxation will never suffer where common sense is used in adjusting matters, but taxes will increase and industries be made perpetual.

I notice that 98,000 acres in southwest Louisiana (denuded pine lands) sold to the Hercules Powder Co. for about \$1.75 per acre. Such lands are assessed at \$4 to \$5 an acre, or 18 to 20 cents per acre annually. The owners will not carry lands where such a burden exists and can not afford to practice reforestation, so must sell for what they can get. I recently purchased several thousand acres to block up my holdings at \$3 per acre. We now own 85,000. My goal is 100,000 acres, which will insure perpetual operations, if I am encouraged by the State to continue.

[Extracts from letter of Hon. Henry E. Hardtner, of Urania, La., to Senator JOSEPH E. RANSEDELL, dated February 28, 1919]

In late years the landowner has become really interested and would gladly assist in solving forestry matters. Taxation and interest on investments has forced the cutting of timber at a rapid rate. It has been a case of compromise, give and take, with the taxing authorities, in order to get by along lines of least resistance. At present town, city, and farm properties are assessed at 33 1/4 to 50 per cent of cash value, while timberlands are assessed at 100 per cent on a 40 to 60 mill basis. Trees were always so plentiful in the United States that only in recent years have the people awakened to the realization that the virgin forests are nearly exhausted.

The lumbermen and owners of forest lands are awake to the calamity which faces us and would engage in the business of reforestation if the Government would give them the protective assistance and encouragement that is necessary for the production of a long-time crop. Reforestation now is akin to reclamation of western desert lands.

Suppose you purchased 2,000 acres of denuded forest lands at \$3 per acre and expended \$5 per acre for planting seedlings, you would have an investment of \$16,000. Taxes and supervision, 20 cents per acre annually; interest, 8 per cent. In seven years the investment has doubled to \$32,000. At the fourteenth year it has doubled again to \$64,000. At the twenty-first year it is \$128,000; at the twenty-eighth year it is \$256,000; at 35 years it is \$512,000; and at 42 years it is \$1,024,000. That is over \$500 per acre, and 40 years is a long time for a little man to wait for returns. At best he might have 10,000 feet to an acre of poor quality lumber which has cost \$50 per thousand feet to grow. At 6 per cent, the cost at 40 years is \$250 per acre, or \$25 per thousand feet. Only governments can well tackle such a job. So reforestation of completely denuded lands by private capital under present laws and conditions is out of the question.

At Urania we practice natural reforestation—that is, we leave seed trees and saplings on the land, which will insure natural reproduction. Thus lands at \$3 per acre in 45 years at 6 per cent, 20 cents annual taxes, increases to \$96,000 in 45 years, or \$10 per thousand feet. Unless the lands are placed under contract by which a fixed value is stipulated, the taxes may be doubled or trebled as the trees grow. Millions of acres would be put to work growing trees in Louisiana under the contract law if the owner were permitted.

Here is the trouble: Consent of the police jury to such contracts must be secured, and this is a difficult matter. Parishes want all the taxes they can get now, and care not for the additional severance tax when the trees are cut or harvested.

Now, you will ask how the Urania Lumber Co. and Great Southern Lumber Co. can afford to grow trees. First, we own the lands which at best have a speculative or fictitious value of say \$3 per acre. Second, we have large investments in mills and other properties which will be wiped out unless raw material is grown. Third, the State and parishes agreed on a fixed rate of taxation of \$1 and \$3 per acre for 40 years. Fourth, there is some sentiment. Fifth, we commenced in time, while our mills were still making a profit which we could use as an investment in growing trees. All landowners are not so situated. There are now 10,000,000 acres of idle, denuded forest lands in Louisiana not owned by operators. These lands will forever remain idle unless the Government—the people—does its part and permits an owner to grow trees with the assurance of a profit. Of course, if the Government so wills, these lands can remain idle and that is what the Government—the people—chooses now. My work has demonstrated that forests can be grown, and I think at a profit.

The law in Louisiana, identical as to valuation in 1910, was not taken advantage of by anyone until 1913, when I set aside 28,000 acres under that law. The idea of tying up one's lands for 40 years was considered foolish even at \$1 an acre. Some years later the valuations were fixed at \$3 and \$5 an acre, and parishes had to agree, with the result that landowners saw no attraction in the law. Our forests all over the South were plentiful 20 years ago—they are exhausted now—exhausted before the people realized it. I sounded the note of warning, as you know. The landowner lumberman sees only confiscation now of his cut-over lands if he attempts to hold them and pay on the tax valuation as at present or proposed \$5 minimum, and \$12.50 maximum. On the other hand, if he is forced to pay unreasonable taxes he will sell his lands at \$1 per acre, or they will go to the State for taxes, as in Wisconsin and Michigan, and thus the taxing powers kill the "goose that laid the golden egg."

Too much can not be said of the taxation question. Louisiana is practicing forestry on an extensive scale, and would have done more if the laws had not been changed.

Make it possible for a landowner to practice forestry on somewhat the same terms as the Government enjoys—fix the valuation on land at \$1 per acre, or \$2, or \$3 per acre and a 6 per cent to 10 per cent tax on the forest products when cut, and you will find millions of acres being put to work. Then if the landowner will not take advantage of the law and put his lands to work, a different valuation would apply, or the Government would take it over.

The taxation question is everything, so much so that the United States Forest Service has engaged the services of that great tax expert, Professor Fairchild, of Yale University, who will spend three to five years on research, etc.

Mr. RANSEDELL. I also ask publication of an editorial in the New Orleans Times-Picayune of April 10 last entitled "The Greatest Timber Problem," which is an able discussion of this very important subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The editorial is as follows:

THE GREATEST TIMBER PROBLEM

One of the most all-embracing forestry conferences ever held in the United States has just taken place in our city, on the occasion of the Eleventh Southern Forestry Congress. Its discussions covered a wide field, but the significant fact emerges that regardless of what specific topic had been assigned or selected by the several speakers, foresters, lumbermen, college professors, or scientists alike, and almost to a man they deviated from their theme at some point to make comment on the effect of taxation upon the future growth of our Nation's trees. This was an important element in United States Senator RANSEDELL's elaborate address Friday that had as title "Public Responsibility in Growing the Nation's Timber." But besides this near unanimity of reference to the taxation phase, it is surprising that there should also have been so great a consensus of opinion that taxation is in fact the greatest menace to reforestation, the greatest factor leading to the unwillingness of many owners of tree-worthy lands to go forward with tree cropping on a grand scale.

To be sure, behind this taxation problem lies the shortness of human life and the lack, in many minds and hearts, of the altruism that is needed to induce a landowner to put labor and money into a project the profits of which, whatever they may be, will not, because they can not, mature during the lifetime of the tree planter.

This latter fact is no longer entirely true, since new uses, especially paper manufacture, have been found for regrown trees of 10 to 20 years' maturity. But naturally building even for as remote a time as that loses much of its appeal for landowners of advancing years. But when the disinclination superinduced by the certainty of a delay of possible profit reaching down into future decades is stimulated by the prospect of a steady, and maybe steadily increasing, tax drain in prospect throughout the intervening years, disinclination is very likely to become positive refusal. Then there arises the probability that areas of land, unsuited for other agricultural purposes and left unplanted to trees and giving no return to the owner to supply taxation money, are likely to revert into Government hands, thus destroying the last vestige

of local tax returns. At that point the loss becomes general, harming alike the former owners, the local county and township, the Nation as a tax gatherer, and the national public as a loser of the service of the lumber that should have been regrown on those lands.

The situation thus outlined brings forest perpetuation to a difficult pass, to what some almost regard as an impasse. It is not claimed even by the most aggressive opponents of the taxation obstacle that these regrowth properties should go untaxed. This was reiterated by many speakers during the New Orleans forestry congress. There is willingness to pay a tax when the crop grown will have been harvested. Doubtless the reason why it is world practice to collect taxes annually is because so great a majority of our crops are annual crops. The producer is assumed to have earned his profit before being called upon to pay the Government its share. To insist on these regrowth taxes being paid in full each year for from 10 to 50 years before receiving any earnings from the property is too unreasonable for contemplation. And yet from the other angle, although yearly cashing in is impossible, the increment of value does exist and does grow from year to year as a potential profit. The owner thereof can, of course, dispose of this potential value in a kind of futures transaction to some one else willing to carry on the load, and therefore he can not expect and does not expect to be in a position to escape taxation by selling out in advance of the crop's severance tax at maturity. So what is to be done to avoid the dread of an impasse? More thought still will be required before a satisfying answer will have been supplied. This still remains our greatest timber problem.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, in connection with my remarks and by request of Dr. Wilson Compton, who is secretary and manager of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a brief article by him entitled "Reforested America," which is a reply to an article which was made a Senate document by request of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] on the 2d of February last.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The article is as follows:

"REFORESTED AMERICA"

(A reply to "Deforested America," which was printed as a Senate document on request of Senator CAPPER February 2, 1929)

Mr. Gifford Pinchot, former Forester of the United States, has addressed an open letter to the newspapers of the United States in which he advertises a piece of immoderate propaganda in the interests of governmental regulation of the forest industries, entitled "Deforested America," by Maj. G. P. Ahern, who for years has been an ardent advocate of the development of lumbering operations in the Tropics for American markets. Mr. Pinchot then restates his familiar and periodic argument, periodically rejected by the people of the United States, in behalf of Government control of the lumber industry.

Meanwhile the lumber industry and the timberland owners continue, in cooperation with the agencies of the Government and of the several States, in adding to the substantial progress already made toward the protection and perpetuation of the forests. They believe that to perpetuate the forests and the wood-using industries is more important than to protect a handful of professional prophets of forest disaster from the disappointment of seeing the "forest problems" gradually solved, at moderate cost, in the simple, direct, and practical manner now under way instead of at immoderate cost in the complicated, indirect, and impractical manner which they have chosen to advocate.

THEORY OR PRACTICE

Mr. Pinchot is, of course, well aware of the fact that even without the burden of bureaucratic administration, such as he has in mind, the lumber industry has been notoriously unprofitable for the last eight years, even though operating very largely on naturally grown timber. The fact that he, a man of large wealth and with a sentimental and professional interest in forestry from his early youth, has, himself, never engaged in the business of growing timber as a commercial enterprise, although he has insisted that others do it who are much less able than he, is itself an indication of the lack of vital or irresistible economic lure in such undertaking.

On the other hand, notwithstanding discouraging commercial conditions, the lumber and timber industries themselves have been making steady progress in the protection of forest lands, in selective cutting of timber, toward sustained yield, and in artificial planting and the encouragement of natural reforestation.

The Forester of the United States says in his annual report just published:

"One of the most significant developments of the past few years, as previous reports have brought out, has been a changing attitude of large timberland owners and of the lumber and other forest-using industries toward forestry.

"Timber growing is no longer regarded as something outside the range of business consideration. Instead there is a widespread open-mindedness and a general acceptance of the fact that it will have to be undertaken. But private land management for this purpose must at best come gradually. It calls for skill in applying the right woods

practices; for going industrial enterprises it calls, as a rule, for a large readjustment, if not a radical making over, of financial structure and operating plans; and, beyond that, it calls for favorable conditions. The landowner will apply conservative woods practices (assuming that he knows what they are) only if and where he believes they will pay. No forester would undertake to advise a landowner that timber growing would constitute in his case a sound investment without first ascertaining whether the specific conditions are favorable. Very commonly they are not."

A DIFFICULT BUSINESS

In the same report the Forester of the United States recognizes the public responsibility for the encouragement of private forestry and the handicaps now imposed by the public. Among them are ruinous taxation, which frequently absorbs all new-growth values; inadequate public assistance in forest-fire prevention and suppression; and actual, although perhaps unintentional, encouragement of cut-throat competition in the distribution of lumber, which is disastrous alike to forestry and to the prosperity of the wood industries.

To these economic handicaps should be added that of the constantly fiercer competition of other materials, which in some regions already have virtually deprived tediously and expensively regrown timber of paying markets for its products. Now come Mr. Pinchot and Major Ahern, respectively gentleman of leisure and retired Army officer, having no responsibility—and offering to assume none—for the maintenance of the vital forest industries, the integrity of their huge investments, or the maintenance of the opportunities for employment which provide a livelihood to millions of our people, with the proposal, already discredited by convincing experience, to paralyze an already struggling industry under the burden of bureaucratic regulation. That is the economic formula offered the people of the United States by professional forest reformers whose views, notoriously, are not shared by the vast majority of the members of the eminent profession of forestry, who believe that it is more important that trees be grown in the woods than on paper.

It is not a formula for the salvation of the forests. It is a formula for the vindication of the professional reformers, who have prophesied forest disaster for so long that apparently they must now produce it. Twenty years ago Mr. Pinchot gave our forests about 30 years—and still they are with us and promise so to continue.

FORESTRY MUST PAY OR FAIL

It is obvious, as the Forester of the United States and his predecessor have plainly said, that forestry by individual enterprise, like any other business, must pay its way. While the closest critics in Washington, unencumbered by any responsibility for the adverse consequences of their act, are harassing the forest industries, the latter are steadily going ahead, trying to adapt forestry practice to business requirements, the only permanent foundation for private forest perpetuation. The large industrial companies which happen to own the trees which their treeless critics, Mr. Pinchot and Major Ahern, would willingly regulate—some hundreds of them—are already practicing industrial forestry; and, despite the annoyances and discouragements contrived by the professional prophets of forest woe, they will do more of it. These industries know that their perpetration is dependent on forest growing. It is more vital to them than to any other group of citizens.

The Society of American Foresters, of which both Mr. Pinchot and Major Ahern are members, it is interesting to note, is itself finding in its survey the undeniable disproof of their assertion that no substantial forestry progress is being made. According to findings of its recent surveys, in addition to 165 large companies practicing industrial forestry, 46 additional companies are carefully studying their holdings with a view to permanent operations; 41 large concerns are cutting no trees below a certain diameter or are cutting conservatively or leaving seed trees; 7 others are logging selectively; 6 others are using special care to protect young growth; 26 others are making thinnings or cuttings to promote new growth.

NEGATIVE FORESTRY GROWS NO TREES

These records, moreover, take no account of the enormous amount of unmanaged natural reforestation, nor of companies which have taken only the first fundamental step in forestry, the protection of their lands from fire, which the United States Forest Service has declared to be 75 per cent of the reforestation problem. Already at least 30 per cent of the lumber produced in the United States is from second, third, or fourth cuttings from the same land. The area under some sort or degree of private fire protection is not less than 200,000,000 acres.

Nine years ago a mere handful were practicing forestry in any form. Still we are asked to believe that practically no progress is being made.

Instead of spending large sums in deceptive propaganda, as carelessly charged by Messrs. Pinchot and Ahern, the associated timber and lumber industries are spending many millions of dollars yearly in the fundamental forestry work of creating commercial conditions that will make tree growing and forest perpetuation profitable and therefore practicable, by maintaining dependable and profitable uses and markets for their products, and by encouraging the proper conception of the forests as a resource forever usable and forever renewable. If they don't succeed,

commercial timber growing by private enterprise will not succeed. If they do, it will.

Negative forestry by appeal and resort to governmental control will grow no trees. It will, however, add effectively to the discouragements and obstacles to private forestry enterprise. More important, it will drive the practice of forestry out of private enterprise and into the hands of the Government. It is not to the interest of either the wood-using industries or the public that the growing of trees—our one replaceable natural resource—become an exclusive Government enterprise. It is to the interest of both that private enterprise be encouraged by wise public cooperation to go as far as it can in providing a permanent supply of forests and forest products. Under favorable conditions it will go far.

NATIONAL LUMBER MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION,
WILSON COMPTON, *Secretary and Manager.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 8, 1929.

EXHIBIT A

SPEECH OF UNITED STATES SENATOR JOSEPH E. RANDELL BEFORE THE
SOUTHERN FORESTRY CONGRESS, NEW ORLEANS, LA., APRIL 5, 1929

REFORESTATION OR DEFORESTATION?

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, the first man found the earth covered with vegetation, a large part of it being forests. When he reached the agricultural stage, it was necessary for him to remove the forests in many places in order that he might dig his living from the earth. Quite naturally he came to regard the forest as one of his principal enemies, rather than his best friend. He found that the forest not only occupied the ground and prevented his cultivation of it but it also harbored wild beasts, and sometimes wilder men, who sought to destroy him. With such an environment it was natural that he should ruthlessly devastate the forests, which he did.

In our own country the boundless expanse of forests and the seemingly impossible task of seriously depleting them caused an attitude on the part of Americans much like that of earlier civilizations.

Wood in its multitudinous forms is something we can not well do without. No nation ever has. Wood means houses, boxes, fuel, shingles, ties, posts, poles, magazines, newspapers, and so forth. It means a wealth of things on which our whole economic structure is predicated.

PAST AND PRESENT LUMBER SUPPLY

The longevity of the lumber industry depends on:

- (1) The number of trees now in existence.
- (2) The drain upon the timber supply.
- (3) The rate at which forests are restored.
- (4) The extent of cooperation in reforestation work.

The virgin forests of the United States originally covered about 822,000,000 acres, according to the Federal Department of Agriculture. This does not include Alaska. The most thorough study of forest conditions in this country was submitted to Congress in pursuance of Resolution 311 on June 1, 1920. That report indicated that of the original forest area there remains little more than half, or approximately 463,000,000 acres, of which at the time about 135,000,000 were still virgin. The distribution by regions in the South, of the original forests, the present total area, and the virgin area in each region is shown in the following table:

Region	Original acres	Present	
		Total acres	Virgin acres
South Atlantic and East Gulf.....	170,240,000	99,000,000	18,300,000
Lower Mississippi.....	128,400,000	78,865,000	20,835,000

In 1920 it was estimated that the annual growth of our forests was only about one-fourth our annual consumption and waste. It is not likely that a study made now would materially change the general trend of these figures. Taken as a whole, Europe grows each year considerably more wood than it cuts, and cuts almost as much as it uses. The United States cuts slightly more than it uses, and is therefore a net exporting country. In other words, as a whole, Europe is increasing its forest capital, while the United States is gradually reducing its forest capital. We are exhausting our wood supply not because we cut too much but because we grow too little.

A Senate Select Committee on Reforestation reported to Congress in 1924 that as far as the data available permitted striking a balance, it appears that approximately 10,000,000 acres of forest land are cut over annually and that the remaining saw timber of softwood species is disappearing approximately eight and a half times as fast as new growth is replacing it. Our hardwood saw timber is disappearing approximately three and a half times as fast as it is being replaced. Including fuel woods, small material utilized in paper making and distillation, and all other products of the forest, it may be said that 25 per cent of the current drain upon the national supply of wood is replaced by growth, while 75 per cent is an unreplaced depletion of the visible supply.

The presence of idle lands, slacker acres, constitutes one of the greatest problems in America to-day. Many refer to our denuded lands as a liability, but I am prone to be optimistic and regard them as an asset. Where will our future timber supply come from? In my judgment, from the lands that are now cut over, which must be made to reproduce a timber crop. In other words, what are now forested areas will become barren when their trees are cut, if the logging practices of the past are continued, and our existing cut-over areas will have to produce the timber supply of the future if we are to perpetuate in our own country the timber needed for home use.

NEED FOR REFORESTATION

The cedars of Lebanon are spoken of in history; but they exist in memory only. The trees that flourished luxuriantly in biblical days are no more. As they were cut and used, no provision for the future was made. Ancient civilizations passed with the destruction of their forests and we should feel deep concern at this fate, for there is no article of commerce in our amazing modern life into which wood is not figured somewhere.

Our population is increasing at the rate of 1,000,000 a year, which means about 200,000,000 in the year 2000. North America uses about one-half of all the timber consumed in the world. There are about 200,000 known kinds of tree-attacking insects, which cause a loss of approximately \$100,000,000 annually. There are about 81,000,000 denuded and practically barren acres in this country. About two-thirds of our population use wood for fuel. These facts should cause serious consideration.

We would be greatly alarmed if told there would be no wheat crop this year and no bread after a certain date. Unless we replenish our wood supply, the day must surely arrive when this country will become barren or much less capable of producing and maintaining a great race of men than now. The history of lumber manufacture in the United States has been one of successive migrations into fresh fields, each shift leaving the main saw-milling industry farther removed from the principal consumers of its products. One of the most serious aspects of our national situation is the unbalanced geographical distribution of the standing timber that still remains. As this timber becomes more and more depleted, there is no foreign source to which we can turn with any certainty, either of obtaining adequate supplies or of securing them at a reasonable cost. The forests of Mexico, Canada, and South America could at best afford a partial and expensive stop-gap.

Because of its proximity to other countries from which ample supplies of wood could be procured, for a long time it was not felt necessary in England to devote much systematic attention to the home production of timber. Its merchant marine could attend to the importation of timber from other lands, and so it did—until the World War. It was then proved conclusively that no nation is safe without its own wood supply. Great Britain no longer intends to be caught with its timber supply cut off by hostile submarines, and is now engaged in a broad forestry program.

On the other hand, it was providential for France that it had so much forest area near its frontier during the great conflict. Up and down the battle line the forests played a very important part. When one stands by the graves of the men who died fighting in these woods, he is not concerned about the loss of the trees, but they did their share too. France realized more than ever the wisdom of the provision of its forest ordinance made in 1669—260 years ago—requiring the maintenance of a "reserve" of 25 per cent of the yield in communal forests. Without this surplus it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to meet the demands of the French and allied troops for wood absolutely essential along the battle front.

MAKING THE PUBLIC "FOREST MINDED"

It is said that the famous Roman senator, Cato, made but one speech, but he made it every time he had a chance. It was "Delanda est Carthago"—"Carthage must be destroyed." He had one idea and kept hammering at it at every opportunity. So with the forest-crop idea. We must all keep hammering at it until the general public is awakened to the necessity for reforestation and becomes forest minded. As a whole the people of Europe are far more educated in forestry than those of this country. During the World War a colonel in the United States Army was continually bothered by a small branch outside his quarters which struck him in the face when he went out. Finally this provoked him and he directed his orderly to cut it off the tree. Several days later the colonel received a bill from the French Government for the damage done. The French law is exceedingly strict in the regulation of the private owner. In practice he may manage and exploit his forest as much as he likes, provided, however, the land shall be continued under forest. If privately owned forest land is devastated by any cause whatever, improper methods of cutting, grazing, fire, or clearing without the previous sanction of the Government, the owner is subject to fines and other penalties in large sums, and to the requirement, also under penalty, that he reforest the area within a prescribed time. No excuses or explanations are accepted or allowed. The case rests on the fact that the land has been cleared illegally.

Public opinion does remarkable things and a great part of the success of the reforestation movement depends on the attitude of the public.

It certainly behooves the business men of the South to look to the future and arouse a strong, general, well-organized public sentiment in favor of systematic reforestation of all idle cut-over land. One organization that has been looking ahead is the American Tree Association, of Washington, D. C., headed by Mr. Charles Lathrop Pack, who has given me the privilege of making the first public announcement of its program for the purpose of adding some 30,000,000 acres to the forest-producing land of the Gulf States. He has recently had a survey made of these States—Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas—and reports that there are approximately 30,000,000 acres of idle forest land in them, which are not naturally restocking to forests. The campaign which he has planned aims to bring back these idle acres to a condition in which they will be producing a profitable forest crop. Some of this land is owned by the State, some by the Federal Government, but most of it by private owners. Efforts will be made to show these private owners how their lands can, by proper protection from fire, which will permit natural regrowth of trees, and planting where it is necessary, be made so productive at a comparatively slight cost that they will return a profit to their owners and add tremendously to the resources of the South.

In such a program we of the South are vitally concerned, for its development means great additional prosperity. The preliminary figures compiled by the American Tree Association show the idle forest land in the South which is not naturally restocking itself to be distributed as follows: Florida, 2,500,000 acres; Georgia, 6,500,000 acres; Alabama, 2,000,000 acres; Mississippi, 8,000,000 acres; Louisiana, 4,000,000 acres; and Texas, 6,000,000 acres. These figures should give us the greatest concern. It is very evident that we must plant new forests, and keep fire out of those that we have. Forest planting in the Southern States is extremely important, but our chief difficulty is fire protection.

The program of the American Tree Association for the Gulf States, will, therefore, resolve itself largely into endeavors to aid the State forestry departments in acquiring appropriations for larger nurseries and larger production of seedlings to supply demands of small wood-lot owners, farmers, and other timberland proprietors. It will require much educational work to get such owners to become more interested in replanting their nonproductive areas than they are at present. And it is gratifying that the newspapers of the States, almost without exception, are very strongly in favor of such a program.

Another important body which is doing much to arouse public interest in favor of proper appreciation of our forest is the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association.

This powerful organization is not merely a trade body interested in finding more and better markets for sawed boards. Its appropriation for lumber and reforestation propaganda is increasing by leaps and bounds. Slightly over a year ago the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association had pledged to it \$1,000,000 a year for five years' duration. This money was pledged, not solely to further the consumption of more lumber, but to promote economy in wood-utilization practice and add to our reserves of timber in the future. Later this appropriation was increased \$50,000 per annum when Canada joined forces with them. Recently it was increased another \$100,000 per annum when the manufacturers of furniture added to their strength.

This powerful alignment of industrial forces is a great constructive aid to reforestation. It sees clearly that the future of the lumber and paper industries is dependent for its life upon the working out of this problem. Wherever the association's men go and whatever contacts they make to urge and encourage the use of lumber and its products they emphasize also the importance and practice of insuring our future lumber supply through reforestation. This association includes in its organization an industrial forester. He is carrying on a study of the progress that is being made in various sections of the country in industrial forestry; that is, in the growing of timber for commercial profit. In fact, it is due to this association's initiative that the first comprehensive effort to determine the possibilities of perpetual operations in the hardwood industry of the South is now under way. Another way in which they are furthering forest preservation is in urging the economical use of lumber.

The results of this association's efforts have been felt in every corner of our country. Powerful propaganda of this kind are among the forces which are compelling us to adopt measures for reforestation which are working so well to-day in France, Germany, and England.

The programs of these two and other organizations are bound to be powerful factors in educating the public and making it "forest minded."

GREATER UTILIZATION OF TIMBER

In recent years much progress has been made in the greater utilization of timber, although the lumber industry is far from its goal of as complete utilization as possible of every log that is cut by the mills. Dr. Julius Klein, head of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, in the Department of Commerce, recently stated that the wood wasted at the sawmills and furniture plants in one Eastern State during a year would require for its transportation a train 200 miles in length—and that State ranks seventeenth in lumber production in the Nation. That bureau also estimates that only between one-third

and one-half of the tree as it stands in the woods is utilized. This is due to the excessive waste in logging and manufacturing processes and to the general failure of our wood-using industries to coordinate their activities so that one plant is using the raw material discarded by another. The South has some shining examples of such coordinated raw-material policy—for instance, the Great Southern Lumber Co. at Bogalusa, the Masonite Corporation in Mississippi, etc. Close utilization of raw material not only reduced the operating cost of the plants and turns waste wood into useful products but it lays the only sound foundation for commercial reforestation.

Chemical treatment of timber eliminates much waste of forest products by reducing the amount of renewals due to destruction by decay and insect attack. This industry may be considered one of the greatest aids to-day in establishing and maintaining the position that lumber should hold in the field of construction, for two main reasons: (1) By the application of modern methods of preserving timber, this material can be made absolutely immune from attack by decay or insects. (2) Experience has demonstrated the indisputable fact that properly treated timber structures have lasted 40 years and better, where untreated structures would not have lasted under similar conditions a fourth as long. Thus one tree may be said to do the work of four or more.

Our wood requirements are rapidly changing in character. In house construction the wall board is playing an increasingly important part, and so are such insulating boards, both made from wood. Wood is taking the place of metals and even glass for containers. There are to-day milk bottles on the market made of wood pulp. Many of our paints and varnishes are made from wood chemicals, and even sawdust is ground into wood flour and used for hundreds of different purposes—in butcher shops, packing houses, stables, the leather industry, wire novelties, cement, curing, plaster board, hand soaps, storage of ice, etc. Our naval stores industries are furnishing raw material for the pharmaceutical trade, paints and varnishes, paper, and a multitude of other articles. This diversification of products and the close utilization of the raw material will eventually put the wood industries on the same basis as the meat-packing industry. Yet, in spite of these new uses of lumber, I wish to repeat that only one-third to one-half of the tree as it stands in the woods is utilized.

If every inch of a log were used for some purpose or other, the problem of waste would not then be solved, for in the background there rests a more serious kind of waste—many millions of acres of idle, unproductive, denuded lands. While lumbermen are trying to "clean their plates," a number of them seem to overlook their duty to put the slacker acres to work and thereby replenish the timber supply for the future. In too many sections of the Nation countless stumps stand like black ghosts of the past—monuments to man's carelessness and lack of foresight.

Fortunately, some of our mill men have not been so careless and short-sighted, but have so handled their forests as to make them last forever. Two shining examples in Louisiana of this wise policy are Henry Hardtner and the late W. H. Sullivan.

WHO SHOULD UNDERTAKE REFORESTATION?

The question arises, Who should undertake reforestation? Generally speaking, I am not disposed to advocate wide extension of public ownership. It has weaknesses, yet also special advantages, such as ability to command large amounts of capital at minimum rates of interest, continuity of operations, and relative stability of policy. Public ownership of our unproductive forest lands should be distributed in an equitable fashion, under a well-conceived plan, between municipalities, counties, States, and the Federal Government. We must recognize that some adverse conditions can be more effectively overcome under public forest ownership rather than under private. But where individuals or corporations are willing to make the investment necessary for forest establishment and protection, there is no need for action by the State. However, where the choice lies between State action and no action, there is but one sound economic course and that is for the State to act in order to promote public welfare.

UNJUST TAXATION A HINDRANCE TO REFORESTATION

Taxation has never in the history of the world been pleasant. There is something peculiar about the complaint against taxation of forest property. It is not merely a question of the amount of taxes levied upon forests but, rather, of the method of taxation. Complaints against forest taxation represent not merely the natural resistance to a heavy burden, but the conviction that taxation has power to affect the business of forest growing and the future of the forests in a peculiarly unfavorable manner. Experiments in legislation aimed at solution of this problem have been made in many States. While much progress has been made in the study of the theoretical aspects of the subject and valuable lessons have been learned from this legislative experience, the problem still remains essentially unsolved.

The large areas of cut-over idle forest lands which have already accumulated form a heavy burden upon many States and rural communities. There are numerous distressing examples of loss of population, removal of railroads, decrease in taxable values, migration of industries

if not of whole communities, and general economic and social decay arising from the idleness of large tracts of land after its original timber resources had been destroyed. This is one of the critical phases of the problem.

FEDERAL SURVEY OF FOREST TAXATION PROBLEM

In 1923 the Senate of the United States provided for the appointment of a select committee to investigate the problems of reforestation. In submitting its report it had this to say on the subject of taxation:

"The burdensome effect of annual property taxes is commonly cited by forest owners as a serious or insurmountable handicap to the growing of timber. A tax paid annually on growing forests which yield no income for 30 or 40 years is equivalent to the taxation of farm land with its growing crops thirty or forty times between seeding and harvest. Such taxes not only consume a large part of the possible returns but compel the grower of timber to advance them long before they are realized. Unless extremely moderate, the yearly taxation of growing forests may debar the investment of funds in such enterprises. * * * By and large, the uncertainties in respect to taxation constitute a serious handicap upon reforestation comparable to the hazard of loss from forest fires."

The Federal Government has sensed the seriousness of the forest tax problem, as is evidenced by section 3 of the Clarke-McNary Reforestation Act, which became a law in 1924. Out of this provision grew the so-called forest taxation inquiry, which is being directed by Fred Rogers Fairchild, professor of political economy at Yale University. The inquiry is charged with the duty of making a nation-wide investigation of the entire problem of taxation in its relation to forests. This is obviously a task of great magnitude and complexity. The inquiry has been actively engaged upon its researches for a period of about two years, and it is expected that several more years will be required for the completion of the undertaking.

FORESTS AND FLOOD CONTROL

The influence of forests in regarding run-off and thus diminishing the destructive power of floods and the value of forests in binding soils and preventing erosion have resulted in many forest areas in civilized nations being established as protection forests and placed under public control. These are largely in mountainous regions where, by reason of the nature of the soil, topography, and climate, conditions causing accelerated run-off are most critical and most apt to result from ordinary private use of the land surface.

Public ownership of nonagricultural forest lands on important watersheds is the logical outcome of the free play and development of natural economic laws and forces. The private owner of forest land in steep, rough regions can not be expected to manage his property for the public benefit when that means loss of revenue or increased expense. Conversely, the owner of properties which may be injured by the misuse of such land can not safely rely upon the owner of the forest to give other lands contributory protection. Consequently, where widely scattered but important interests may be jeopardized by unwise use of land, the only fair and safe course is for the public to step in and take charge of the key property under terms and conditions fair to the original owner.

FORESTS AND FLOODS IN OTHER COUNTRIES

Forest destruction in China has probably gone further than in any other nation. Thousands of square miles of forest have been cut down and destroyed in the shifting system of agriculture employed by the Chinese, or for fuel, and the herds of sheep and other livestock pastured on the cut-over lands have prevented the reestablishment of forest cover. The result has been the devastation of tremendous areas of country and the washing of millions of tons of earth from hillsides into the streams and valleys, raising the beds of the rivers and the flood crest. Many of the famines that China has experienced have been due directly or indirectly to the floods from these devastated slopes.

The conditions described for China have been repeated on a small scale in several other nations. Thus, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Asia Minor, and portions of Africa have all gone through somewhat similar experiences. Spain contains in some of its provinces only 10 per cent of their former populations, and Greece now supports but 5 per cent as many people as when it was known throughout the ancient world for its sculptors, poets, orators, philosophers, and statesmen. North Africa was at one time not only self-supporting but was the granary for many of the Mediterranean nations. Asia Minor as a result of deforestation has become a parched and dying country. Spain and Portugal both have lost productiveness amounting to approximately 80 per cent of their former agricultural lands.

Palestine, now but a memory and a shrine, was at one time the most productive section of the ancient world, crowned with cities and villages of such prominence that Rome considered Palestine one of its most important contributing colonies. But Palestine of to-day is decidedly different from the ancient times because it has since been overrun by the Turks, and the mountains, once bearing the magnificent forests of the cedar of Lebanon, are now devastated and support but few scraggly forests and poorly cared-for brush lands. Erosion, the direct result of the removal of the forest, has contributed greatly to the

seriousness of the floods now almost annually experienced in this region and Palestine to-day is engaged in a big reclamation project to overcome the results of forest destruction.

So also the Turks in their destruction of the forests of Asia Minor have contributed materially to the reduction of the wealth of that section and provided for an increase in floods and attendant erosion.

France, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and Japan have each recognized the special function of protection forests, and each places such areas under public control. This principle has been carried furthest in Japan, where, owing to the mountainous character of the country, it was most urgently needed. In that little nation a total of 4,534,335 acres in 353,549 parcels has been placed under public control as protection forests. Protection forests in Japan are established against soil erosion, for water supply, against sand shifting, wind, tides, floods, avalanches, rolling stones, for fisheries, public health, guiding navigators, and for scenery.

Protection forests are also maintained by our own Government. Up to June 30, 1927, a total of 2,892,721 acres had been purchased for the protection of navigable streams. These lands lie in the White, Allegheny, Appalachian, Ozark, and Ouachita Mountains.

The United States Forest Service has just issued a pamphlet entitled "Forest and Flood Relationships in the Mississippi River Watershed," in which it is stated:

"The reduction in flood flow, due to the influence of forests, has been here expressed in inches of flood crest on the Mississippi, based on General Jadwin's statements. This shows that under the present conditions forests are responsible for 14.64 inches of water, which could, by proper protection, proper care, and proper management, be raised to 55.03 inches. And this reduction is made at the source, and the water does not have to be handled in any way by human contrivances.

"Expressed in terms of reservoirs, the present forests in the Mississippi River drainage exert a beneficial influence upon the flood flow equivalent to 1.26 reservoirs of 10,000,000 acre-feet capacity. Properly protected, cared for, and managed, they would be approximately equivalent in their beneficial influence to 4.6 reservoirs."

SOUTHERN FORESTRY NEEDS

Although the Southern Forestry Congress has not been in existence very long, its accomplishments have been in the interest of true forestry practices. My message to its members is to work vigorously for the enlargement of the Southern Forest Experiment Station located in this city. Moreover, there is a crying need for a thorough survey of the hardwood situation in the South. There seems to be practically no knowledge of the true conditions affecting this phase of the lumber industry.

While the Federal Government has cooperated with the States in fire-protection work, there exists urgent need for an enlarged program of replanting our cut-over lands. In only three Southern States—Florida, Arkansas, and Alabama—the Government owns forest lands, and the combined areas in these States is very small. Germany, France, England, and especially Japan are replanting at a much more rapid rate than our Government. In fostering an enlarged program of this kind, the Southern Forestry Congress will help to solve this urgent need.

In spite of the limited funds at its disposal, Louisiana is by odds the leader of the South in reforestation. Its reforestation contract law, whereunder the legislature has fixed a limit on the yield tax on lands under contract for reforestation purposes, has been one of the most successful of all the laws dealing with this subject throughout the entire United States. The law provides that the timber owner who devotes his land to reforestation purposes under contract shall not be taxed on the value of the timber prior to the time of cutting up to a maximum period of 50 years. The land will, of course, be taxed at its actual cash value exclusive of the timber. There are at present more than 300,000 acres under reforestation contract in Louisiana and the success of the law is due to the fact that it is equitable, fair to the State, and fair to the landowner.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion let me appeal to you as southerners to make the South assume real leadership in reforestation work. It has led in some of the most significant steps this Nation has ever made. With a productive climate and deep, fertile soil, conditions are just as favorable to rapid tree growth in the South to-day as in the days that are gone. In this work time is the important thing. It is easy to fell a tree, but to replace it in the forest is far more difficult. Each year's delay means another year of forest fires and another year's postponement of the harvesting. Practically in no other region of the world exist such favorable factors of rapid growth, accessibility to markets, and valuable tree species as in the South.

Nature stands ready to do her share—man alone has been derelict, but I prophesy that, under the inspiration and leadership of this great Southern Forestry Congress, the mistakes of the past will be corrected and the United States will assume its place in the front rank of the reforesting nations of the world.

The South should lead this march of progress and certainly not let it be said of us that we have retreated in the great movement of putting our millions of slacker acres to work by reforesting them.

The poet Whittier has well said:

"Give fools their gold and knaves their power,
Let fortune's bubbles rise and fall,
Who saves a field or trains a flower,
Or plants a tree is more than all."

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fletcher	King	Shortridge
Ashurst	Frazier	La Follette	Simmons
Barkley	George	McKellar	Smith
Bingham	Gillett	McMaster	Smoot
Black	Glass	McNary	Steck
Blaine	Glenn	Metcalf	Steiwer
Blease	Goff	Moses	Swanson
Borah	Goldsborough	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho
Bratton	Greene	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Brookhart	Hale	Nye	Townsend
Broussard	Harris	Oddie	Trammell
Burton	Harrison	Overman	Tydings
Capper	Hastings	Patterson	Tyson
Caraway	Hatfield	Phipps	Vandenberg
Connally	Hawes	Pine	Wagner
Copeland	Hayden	Pittman	Walcott
Couzens	Hebert	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Hedlin	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	Warren
Deneen	Johnson	Robinson, Ind.	Waterman
Dill	Jones	Sackett	Watson
Edge	Kean	Schall	Wheeler
Fess	Keyes	Sheppard	

Mr. SCHALL. My colleague the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is ill and confined to the hospital. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] will proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hardly suppose at this stage of the discussion of the farm relief bill, so called, that any Senator could hope to change or influence many votes, if any single vote, by anything he might say on the subject; but I desire to offer to the Senate some observations with reference to two or three phases of the subject which I think ought to be considered especially in connection with our position on the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON].

There are three questions, it seems to me, that ought to occupy our attention in connection with the subject. One is, Is there a farm problem? Another is, If there is a farm problem, what produced it? The third question is, If there is a farm problem, what is the remedy for it?

In order that we may understand, at least to our own satisfaction, what remedy may be offered or suggested that contains wisdom, it is advisable that we consider the causes of the farm situation with which we are now undertaking to deal and which we are seeking to remedy. There are many people in the country who take it for granted that because in the whole history of the world there have been certain portions of our people either willing or compelled to till the soil, that condition will continue throughout the future history of the world and therefore it makes little difference what the economic and financial relationship may be between agriculture and other industries and other groups.

In talking over the farm situation a few days ago with a distinguished gentleman he offered the criticism that the trouble with the farmer to-day is that he has too many automobiles and too many radios. No man who entertains that viewpoint is in any position to deal fairly with agriculture. I do not desire to detain the Senate by a discussion of the relative merits of the farmer who desires an automobile and the banker or merchant or manufacturer who desires one. I have no disposition to waste time undertaking to discuss the right of farm families located in isolated communities to have the privilege of enjoying music, oratory, and entertainment in their living rooms and in their homes just as other people desire to do. The man who looks upon those who are engaged in agriculture from the standpoint that they are seeking to a greater extent than they deserve to enjoy the same blessings and the same facilities enjoyed by other people, of course, has no right, in my judgment, to be considered in determining what shall be the remedy offered for the solution of this question.

I do not suppose that anybody in his right mind and who has given any study to the question doubts that there is a farm problem. During the years 1922, 1924, 1925, and 1926 an aver-

age of nearly two million people each year left the farms and went to the cities. That movement is in progress each year, offset by some slight movement from the city back to the farm; but, according to the most reliable figures, during the years 1922, 1924, 1925, and 1926—the four years which I have mentioned—there was a net loss of 3,600,000 people from the farms of the United States, and that much of a gain to the cities.

It is a remarkable fact, Mr. President, that in spite of the tremendous increase in our total population by the natural process of increase, the farm population has dropped and is dropping year by year to a lower level in comparison with the total population of the United States. It would seem in the natural order of things that this would tend largely to solve the farm problem, because every time a million people leave the farm and go to the city, by that number the number of producers is decreased and by the same number the number of consumers is increased; but, notwithstanding the fact that this process has been going on for years, it has not solved the farm problem. Indeed, it has made no serious contribution to the solution of the farm problem, because the farmer, on the whole, is in a worse condition to-day than he was eight years ago, than he was five years ago, and two years ago.

Not only that, Mr. President, but during the last six or eight years the value of farm property in the United States, according to the testimony of various experts, economists, and statisticians, backed up by statements of the former Secretary of Agriculture, has decreased more than \$17,000,000,000. During the same period the value of farm products has decreased \$13,000,000,000; so that the farmers of the United States to-day are \$30,000,000,000 poorer than they were eight years ago.

That \$30,000,000,000, Mr. President, represents more than the combined value of the 250,000 miles of railroads in the United States, with all of their equipment, terminals, and trains, the value of their entire property. No man can seriously consider these facts without admitting, at least to himself if he does not do it publicly, that there is affecting the farmer a serious problem that does not attach to any other group or any other industry in the United States.

The depression of agriculture has not been confined alone to the United States; it has been a world-wide depression. It has been more serious in the United States probably than in any other country because of the economic disadvantages which attach to agriculture here as compared with industry and finance. Following the World War there was a world-wide depression in both agriculture and industry, but industry was able to revive and recover within the very brief space of a year or two, while agriculture not only has not revived, not only has not recovered, but it has continued to grow more depressed and to suffer greater disadvantages in the United States by a comparison not only with industry but even with agriculture in other portions of the world.

Mr. President, while the farmer has seen the value of his products go down and the value of his land decline, while at the same time the value of other property has increased and the value of other products of toil have multiplied, he has also seen his net income decline until in 1926, the last year for which I have been able to obtain the figures, the average farmer in the United States made an income of less than \$700 per annum compared to more than \$1,500 per year for all other occupations outside of agriculture.

Not only has the farmer seen the value of his property and the value of his products decline and the income of his labor decline but he has at the same time seen his debts increase and accumulate until to-day the farmers of the Nation owe more than \$12,500,000,000. While the farmer has seen his indebtedness increase he has also seen his taxes increase. During the past seven years the farmers have had their taxes increased from \$350,000,000 per annum to more than \$900,000,000 per annum. In the year 1920, Mr. President, there were only 3 States out of the 48 that had more than 60 per cent of tenancy on the farms, but in 1925, 6 of the largest agricultural States of the Nation had a tenancy of more than 60 per cent on the farms of those 6 States, and in 1925 there were 15 States in the Union that had a tenancy of more than 40 per cent on the farms within their borders.

In the State of South Dakota alone the farm mortgage debt increased in five years from \$89,000,000 in 1920 to more than \$100,000,000 in 1925, while in the State of Iowa during the same period the farm mortgage debt increased from \$489,000,000 to \$625,000,000.

The price of hired labor on the farm increased from \$28 per month in 1910 to \$65 per month in 1920, and then dropped back to \$47 per month in 1925.

The number of bankruptcies of farmers increased from 15 out of 100,000 farmers in 1919 to 123 out of every 100,000 in 1925.

When shipping hay to market in 1919, the farmer paid for freight 10 pounds out of every 100 pounds of hay; in 1921 he paid for freight 20 pounds out of every 100 pounds of hay.

A farmer shipping wheat in 1917 paid for freight 3.3 pounds out of each 100 pounds of wheat, while in 1922 he paid 9.3 pounds of wheat out of each 100 in order to transport his wheat from the farm to market.

In 1918 he paid for freight 7 pounds out of each 100 pounds of corn; in 1922 he paid for freight 38 pounds out of each 100 pounds of corn.

In shipping potatoes to market in 1917 he paid for freight 5 pounds out of each 100 pounds, while in 1921 he paid for freight 18 pounds out of each 100 pounds of potatoes shipped.

I do not mention these facts, Mr. President, as any evidence that the increased charges are not justified; but merely to show that the cost of transportation has enormously increased, a cost which the farmer has been compelled to bear.

During the same period the purchasing power of the farmer as compared to pre-war conditions has declined to a little more than 70 per cent of its value before the war.

During the crop year of 1924-25, according to information gleaned from the reports of the Department of Agriculture, the net loss to agriculture as a whole, based upon the same methods of bookkeeping as prevailing in other industries, amounted to more than \$5,000,000,000. In other words, if we consider agriculture as a going business on the same basis that we consider profit and loss in connection with any other industry in the United States, according to information furnished by the Department of Agriculture, we find that agriculture in one year lost \$5,000,000,000, while during that same year industry made a net profit of \$1,677,000,000.

In the last crop year, that of 1927-28, the gross income of six and a half million farmers in the United States amounted to \$12,250,000,000. Adding the total of the charges properly made against the farm industry, considered as a going business, we find that the total of such expenses and charges amounted to more than \$17,000,000,000, which means that the industry as a whole in the last crop year fell short by more than \$5,000,000,000.

The income from the farm since 1920 has not been sufficient to pay a fair return on the value of the capital used for agricultural purposes, nor a fair wage for the farmer's labor, nor to permit farmers and their families to maintain a standard of living comparable with other groups of the same ability.

If we compare the cost of supplies, taxes, interest, railroad rates, wage scales, building costs, and all other elements entering into the situation, we find that the price of farm products since 1920 has fallen below every other item individually and far below the average of them all. In 1919 it required only 5 bales of cotton to discharge a mortgage debt of a thousand dollars, while in 1927 it required 13 bales of cotton to discharge a mortgage debt of \$1,000.

Since 1921, according to the Department of Agriculture, the farmer's costs have averaged 70 per cent higher than in 1914, while the price of his products has only been 29 per cent higher than in 1914. But when we turn to industry we find that prices for nonagricultural products since 1921 have been nearly 68 per cent above pre-war prices, and that industry has been able to increase its efficiency 59 per cent, while agriculture has been able to increase the production of its labor only 30 per cent.

We find that since 1921, according to the Department of Agriculture, the farmer has suffered an average loss of \$3.34 per acre on every acre of tillable soil used for the cultivation of the five principal crops of corn, wheat, oats, cotton, and hay.

It has been reliably estimated by experienced economists and expert statisticians that the net cost of the present tariff laws in the increased cost of living to the Nation as a whole amounts to \$3,600,000,000 per annum to all the people of the United States. If the share of this extra cost represented by the farmers of the Nation can be fairly said to be one-fourth—which, I think, is a reasonable estimate—then this item of increased expense to agriculture amounts to about \$1,000,000,000 per year.

Notwithstanding these appalling conditions to which I have referred, no serious effort has made any headway in bridging the chasm between depressed agriculture and other industries in the United States for which such marvelous prosperity is now claimed.

I am not interested, Mr. President, in any partisan consideration of the farm problem and I do not think we ought to approach it from the standpoint of partisanship, because the great bulk of the farmers of the United States are not concerned about which party or how many parties may bring needed relief to them. What they desire and what they demand is relief. Neither am I greatly concerned about how inconsistent Members of this body or any body may have been in the past in

voting upon agricultural legislation, for we have all been feeling our way in the dark on the subject, and what yesterday may have appeared to be a wise solution may to-day appear perfectly ridiculous and foolish. Therefore, I do not think the charge of inconsistency can lie at the door of any Senator because he may have changed his views about the relative merits of proposals for farm relief. In that connection we also must take into consideration the alternatives that are offered to us at any particular time during the consideration of this or any similar measure. It so happens, however, that the Republican Party has been in power in the Nation since this situation began, and it is claimed that the situation began by reason of some inefficiency or deficiency in the administration that preceded it in 1921 and on back for eight years.

If we desired to enter upon a partisan discussion of this question, and if for the sake of argument it might be admitted that the depression in agriculture, to start with, might have been traced to some inefficiency or deficiency in the party in power for eight years just prior to 1921, then we might as logically reply that the failure to remedy that situation during eight years certainly could be charged to the door of the party which has been in power during the past eight or nine years. I do not, however, desire to approach the matter from that standpoint, and I do not approach it from that angle.

In 1922, however, the leaders of the Republican Party made a gesture toward relief by placing a tariff upon agricultural products coming into the United States. I have no doubt that that effort on the part of some was made in good faith, although many of us who were then Members of Congress predicted that it was not the remedy for the agricultural depression; that it would not bring the relief which agriculture desired, of which it was in need, and which it had a right to demand. But in order that agriculture might at least feel that Congress was making an effort to do what in the last three platforms of your party you promised to do—place it on an economic basis equal to that of industry, whatever that means—in 1922 a tariff law was enacted placing a tariff on agricultural imports.

I think it can be demonstrated beyond the peradventure of a doubt that that tariff has cost the farmer more than it gave him during the last seven years. No less an authority than Hon. Henry A. Wallace, the publisher and editor of Wallace's Farmer, son of a former Secretary of Agriculture under the administration of President Harding, recently made a statement in the newspapers that for every dollar the farmer had gained by reason of the tariff he had lost \$50 in return.

We must consider this situation as it relates to basic agriculture, and not some particular group or crop. I have no doubt that the levying of a tariff upon bananas—as is now requested by men who keep their faces straight—high enough to keep bananas out of the United States might result in the people eating a few more peaches and pears, and thereby render a corresponding benefit to the growers of peaches and pears; but that is not a part of the real agricultural problem that brings us here in this extra session. Undoubtedly the levying of a prohibitive tariff on olives benefits the olive growers and the producers of olive oil in the United States; but the production and marketing of olives is not a part of the great agricultural problem that brings Congress into extraordinary session in an effort to solve it. I am speaking of the basic agricultural commodities of wheat, corn, pork, tobacco, cotton, rice, and things of that sort.

What are the facts with reference to those crops?

In 1926 the value of the six basic crops of the United States amounted to \$5,500,000,000, 44 per cent of the total farm income for that year. We produced in that year 831,000,000 bushels of wheat, valued at a billion dollars. During that year we imported 13,250,000 bushels, valued at \$16,000,000. During that year we exported 206,000,000 bushels of wheat. The imports of wheat amounted to only 6 per cent of the surplus crop of that year, leaving 94 per cent of that surplus crop to be marketed by exportation to other countries.

Will anybody seriously contend that the importation of 13,000,000 bushels of wheat could seriously affect the price of 831,000,000 bushels of wheat? And even the 42 cents per bushel tariff on wheat did not give to the American farmer a higher price than was received in our neighboring Dominion of Canada.

In June, 1927, the cash price of wheat in Minneapolis was \$1.52 per bushel. In Winnipeg it was \$1.61 per bushel, notwithstanding there was a 42-cent tariff on each bushel of wheat that came into the United States. In July of that year wheat sold in Minneapolis at \$1.50 a bushel and in Winnipeg, Canada, at \$1.62 per bushel. In August of the same year in Minneapolis wheat brought \$1.49 per bushel and in Winnipeg \$1.60. It is, therefore, obvious that our wheat growers, who are involved

to a tremendous extent in this agricultural depression, receive no benefit from the tariff of 42 cents a bushel on wheat.

On the 6th day of March, 1924, President Coolidge raised the tariff on wheat from 30 cents a bushel to 42 cents a bushel. On that day in the city of Chicago wheat was selling at \$1.15½ per bushel. On the 27th day of March of the same year, only three weeks later, wheat was selling in the city of Chicago at \$1 per bushel. It went down 15 cents a bushel in three weeks after the President had raised the tariff from 30 cents to 42 cents per bushel.

In 1926 we produced in the United States 2,750,000,000 bushels of corn, valued at \$1,750,000,000. We imported that year 1,100,000 bushels, valued at \$1,000,000, while we exported 20,000,000 bushels. The amount imported was only 5 per cent of the surplus—not 5 per cent of the crop; only 5 per cent of the small surplus of 20,000,000 bushels. If we had had a prohibitive tariff on corn so that the 1,000,000 bushels could not have come in, can anyone seriously contend that it would have materially affected the farm problem of the United States with reference to corn?

In the same year, 1926, there were on the farms of this country 52,000,000 head of hogs, valued at \$15.21 per head. During that year we exported 300,000,000 pounds of pork and 700,000,000 pounds of lard, while only 14,500,000 pounds of pork were imported into the United States from all the foreign countries combined. A higher tariff on pork would not have appreciably affected the present farm problem in the United States either for 1926, 1927, 1928, 1929, or any other year.

In the year 1926 we produced 18,000,000 bales of cotton, valued at \$1,000,000,000, of which we exported 65 per cent, or 11,500,000 bales. We imported that year only 420,000 bales of cotton, valued at \$37,000,000. A prohibitive tariff on cotton that would have kept out those 420,000 bales would not have affected the cotton situation anywhere in the United States to any appreciable extent.

During the same year we produced 42,000,000 bushels of rice, valued at \$46,000,000, and imported two and a half million bushels, valued at \$2,750,000. We exported 17,500,000 bushels and sold it in competition with the rice producers in Japan and other countries where labor is much cheaper than it is in the United States. If we had had a prohibitive tariff on rice that year or any other year that would have prevented the importation of this two and a half million bushels, it could not have materially affected the farm situation with reference to rice in the United States.

During 1926 we produced 1,250,000,000 pounds of tobacco, valued at \$236,000,000. During that year we imported 91,000,000 pounds of tobacco, valued at \$16,500,000, while we exported and sold in the markets of the world 516,000,000 pounds. A prohibitive tariff on tobacco that would have kept out those 91,000,000 pounds that were imported would still have made it necessary for us to find a market for 82 per cent of our surplus tobacco crop in 1926, which was nearly half of the entire crop. So that it could not have materially affected the value of the crop or the farm situation which we are now considering in this extra session of Congress.

The value of the surplus of these crops in 1926 was \$1,069,000,000, and the value of all imports of these products was \$150,000,000, amounting to only 8 per cent in quantity of our total surplus, and 14 per cent in value. If the tariff on these products was raised so high that not a dollar's worth of them could come into the United States from other countries, it would not affect the basic values of these crops, as 90 per cent of the surplus of all these crops would still have to be exported for sale in other countries.

Therefore, an increase in the tariff on these products, which compose nearly half the total of all farm products, can not by itself solve the farm problem nor contribute materially to its solution. No amount of political sophistry will be able to convince the American farmer that any sort of tariff increase that further victimizes him, without any increased benefit being offered in good faith, is a solution of his distressing condition.

By these remarks I do not declare myself against an increase in a tariff on agricultural products. I may vote for such an increase in the tariff on agricultural products, but my contention is that if we fix the tariff so high that not a dollar's worth of agricultural products could come into the United States at all, it would not be a solution of the farm problem which confronts us to-day, and with which we must deal, and which, if possible, we must remedy.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PATTERSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

LXXI—57

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. I think the figures the Senator has given bear out the fact that during the past few years there have been more imports of agricultural products than exports, and if we could place a tariff on agricultural products that come in here in direct competition with the products we can produce as well as not here in the United States, it seems to me it would undoubtedly help us in handling the surpluses we now produce. In other words, on acreage on which we are now producing considerable wheat or cotton or tobacco, or something of that kind, they would raise farm products like those coming in here from foreign countries, which would be kept out if we had a tariff on them, or should be kept out, at least if we had a tariff on them high enough to keep them out.

Mr. BARKLEY. I illustrated a moment ago, if the Senator will recall, that a higher tariff on such articles as bananas or olives might be of benefit to groups of farmers.

Mr. FRAZIER. Of course, bananas we do not produce.

Mr. BARKLEY. That a high tariff on some other farm products might in an isolated community, as to an isolated group of agricultural products, produce some benefit, but it would not solve the important problem which confronts us now, which is to afford relief from the intolerable conditions to which I have referred.

Mr. FRAZIER. No; it is not the whole solution by any means.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Am I to understand that the Senator is opposed to a tariff on farm products?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the Senator did not understand that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Is the Senator opposed to a tariff on farm products?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not. I just said a moment ago that I made no declaration of opposition to a tariff on farm products. I might even vote for an increase.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If the tariff does not do any good, and if as to these things the Senator has enumerated the tariff was not beneficial to the farmers, except to an isolated group here and there, why would the Senator vote now for increasing the tariff?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator from Indiana is seeking to make me appear inconsistent with my own argument. What I stated was that if the tariff, during the year to which I have referred, which I think is a typical year, had been high enough to keep out all the 13,000,000 bushels of wheat, all the million bushels of corn, all the 91,000,000 pounds of tobacco, and the other imports of the six basic commodities to which I have referred, it would not have materially solved the farm problem that confronted the Nation as a whole, and would not materially solve it now.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then, as I understand it, the Senator believes that the protective tariff on farm products during the last few years has not done the farmer any good?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I did not say that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the Senator mean to say that?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think perhaps it may to some extent have benefited him in special instances; but not any appreciable extent would it go toward a solution of this problem with which we are now dealing, and if the tariff in those years had been prohibitive, so that no product at all could have come in in competition with cotton, wheat, rice, tobacco, or the others I mentioned, we would still have the farm problem that we have to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then the Senator concedes that the tariff has done the farmer some good?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I have not and I do not concede that; though in some isolated instance it may have done so; and I am going to proceed to show the Senator from Indiana that it has not done him any good, as a whole; that it may have helped some individual agricultural product, but that taken as a whole, it has hurt the farmer more than it has helped him.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If that is the case, then, as I get it, if it has hurt the farmer more than it has helped him, the Senator would vote to eliminate duties on farm products?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will learn how I will vote on that subject when we get to the tariff bill. I am undertaking to discuss now the results of the situation we have had for the last eight years as it has affected the farm problem we are considering.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I did not want to misunderstand the Senator. I was under the impression that he had

said that it had done the farmer more harm than good, and that still he would vote for a continuation of the tariff duty on agricultural commodities.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not said I would vote for or against the continuation. I will be governed by what I deem best when the time comes to levy a tariff on farm products.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If the Senator had been in this body in 1921, would he have voted for the tariff schedules on farm products?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not necessary to cross bridges which have been burned years ago.

It is difficult to realize, without investigation, the extent to which agriculture has suffered during the last eight years on account of the uneven economic conditions which have surrounded it as compared with other industries.

In November, 1925, the price of all farm products in the United States was 45 per cent above the price of 1913. During the same period the price which the farmer was compelled to pay for the necessities he had to buy increased more than 100 per cent. In 1925 the farmer's purchasing power was only 64 per cent as compared with 1913. The cost of his building materials increased 87 per cent. The cost of his clothing increased 108 per cent. The cost of his bedroom furniture and supplies increased 90 per cent.

It is interesting and instructive to consider the effect of present tariff legislation upon the farmer, not only because you are proposing to increase these burdens within a few weeks but also because you are proposing as a measure of farm relief another gesture in the form of a higher tariff on certain farm products which has already been demonstrated to be of no benefit to him. It will be impossible to consider the effect of present tariff legislation upon the farmers of each State in the Union separately, but I have gathered some information concerning a few of the typical States, which ought to be taken into consideration, not only in connection with the pending bill but also in connection with future tariff legislation.

Let us take the State of Indiana: In 1925 the farmers of Indiana gained the sum of \$859,000 as a result of the present tariff law. At the same time they lost on account of it \$4,826,000—while the whole State of Indiana lost the sum of \$10,760,000. Therefore the net loss to the farmers of Indiana amounted to \$3,967,000, and the net loss to the whole State was \$14,728,000. This was on the agricultural schedule. When we consider the manufacturers' schedule under the present tariff law we find that the cost to the farmers of Indiana amount to \$33,107,000. The cost to others in Indiana not engaged in farming amount to \$70,805,000, making the total cost to the people of Indiana amount to the stupendous sum of \$103,912,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Do I understand the Senator to say that the farmers of Indiana lost money during the past four years because of the tariff?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I was speaking of 1925.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is to say, because there was a tariff protecting the farmers of Indiana from the importation of products raised abroad, with the cheaper standards of living, lower standards of living, and lower cost of production, the tariff wall, being up for the protection of the farmers of Indiana, did them more harm than good because the products from abroad could not get up over the wall. Is that what he means to say?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; that is not what I mean to say. I mean to say that on agricultural products affecting the State of Indiana there was a tariff which benefited it to the extent of \$859,000 in that year, and the cost to the farmer not producing those particular articles on which there was a tariff amounted to \$4,826,000, so that when you strike a balance of gains against losses, the net loss to the farmers of Indiana amounted to \$3,967,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. As I understand it, then, the Senator says that the farmers of Indiana lost money on those commodities because they did not produce them. Is not that what it amounts to?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; not at all; not because they did not produce them but because they were compelled—those who did not produce the articles referred to were compelled—to pay out \$4,000,000 more than the gains to the farmers of Indiana who did produce the articles on which there was a tariff.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. In other words, they paid higher prices on the articles which were protected.

Mr. BARKLEY. They might have done that, and still the farmers receive no benefit from it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If it is true that the protection injures rather than helps, I do not seem to understand why the Senator would vote for a continuation of protection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not said that I would vote for a continuation of protection, if the Senator will recall my remarks. What I am undertaking to say is that even if he and I both were willing to fix the tariff so high on agricultural products that it would keep all articles out of this country, it still would have no appreciable effect in solving the problem which now confronts the farmers of the Nation. That is my position.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then there would be no occasion for voting for increased duties, as I understood the Senator to say he probably would do.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think, myself, that there would be no real occasion except to show the farmer that from a psychological and intellectual standpoint we want him to get in on the tariff if there is any possible direct or indirect benefit that can come from it, but so far as actual results to the farmer are concerned, I think we might as well not vote any tariff on agricultural products affecting these basic commodities. What I say about these basic commodities does not necessarily apply to some isolated crop or some isolated community, where a prohibitive tariff on some given farm product might do some good.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator in his speech, but, as I understand it, the Senator simply clings to the traditional policy of his party—free trade.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. In the first place, the Senator does not understand any such thing. The traditional policy of the Democratic Party never has been free trade and it is not now, and nobody knows that better than the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The Senator probably believes in a tariff for revenue only.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe in a competitive tariff. I believe the tariff ought to be taken out of politics, if the Senator wants to know my position on the tariff. We tried to do that some 10 or 15 years ago by setting up a Tariff Commission to investigate tariffs from an economic standpoint, from the standpoint of business necessity, from the standpoint of competitive interest of our country as compared with other countries, and I believe yet that a proper tariff commission, with a proper personnel, would go a long way toward taking the tariff out of politics and undertaking to solve it along that line.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Republican administrations appointed on the Tariff Commission members who had formerly composed a part of the tariff lobby at the Capitol when tariff bills were under consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true, and not only did that but undertook to secure from one man whose reappointment came up a letter of resignation in advance, to hold over him as a Damocles sword, in the hope that he would either be intimidated by that against making any further recommendations for reductions of tariffs, or it would result in his resignation, or the acceptance of a resignation extracted from him in advance.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. But it should be said, out of respect for that member of the commission, that he declined to accept the appointment under such conditions, and refused to sign such a letter, and he was not reappointed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; and those of us who know him, and knew him, would have expected him to take precisely that position with respect to such reappointment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, as I understand it then, the Senator would remove the tariff from politics, and the protective duties from agricultural products?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; the Senator from Indiana did not understand me to say that, and he did not understand me to mean that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is what I understood the Senator to mean.

Mr. BARKLEY. With all respect to the Senator from Indiana, I do not see how, if he exercised ordinary intelligence, he could have understood any such thing from the language which I used.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Will the Senator state from what he is reading the figures he has given?

Mr. BARKLEY. The figures that I am giving have been gathered by various economic groups, including the Farm Bureau Federation of the United States. I have gathered some of them from a very interesting publication on farm relief by the professor of rural economy of the College of Agriculture of Cornell University, and various other publications that are based upon figures obtained from reports issued by the Depart-

ment of Agriculture of the United States during the last 8 or 10 years.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I understand from what he has just suggested that this is the Senator's own compilation?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it is not the Senator's own compilation. It is my copying of compilations which others have made, and I did not make the compilations myself.

The farmers of Indiana, according to the figures, lost \$44 for every \$1 gained by the tariff on agricultural products. The people of Indiana as a whole lost \$138 for every dollar they gained by the present tariff both on agricultural and industrial products. Calculating the cost to the whole country on this basis, it amounted to \$3,600,000,000 per year.

Let us return to Ohio, which is another typically American State. During the same year the gain to the farmer of Ohio from the agricultural tariff amounted to \$3,220,000. The cost to the farmer on account of the tariff was \$6,084,000. The cost to the other people in Ohio not engaged in agriculture was \$24,578,000. The net result to the farmers of Ohio because of the agricultural tariff was a loss of \$2,864,000. Considering the manufacturing schedule as it applies to Ohio, we find that it cost the farmers of Ohio \$40,510,000. It cost others not engaged in farming \$151,700,000, making the total cost to the people of Ohio \$192,210,000.

Let us consider another typically mid-western State, Illinois. The tariff on agricultural products produced a gain to the farmers of Illinois of \$677,000, but it cost the farmers of Illinois \$5,840,000, while it cost others in Illinois not engaged in farming \$31,207,000, making a total loss to the people of Illinois of \$37,047,000. The net loss to the farmers of Illinois from the operations of the present tariff on agricultural products amounted to \$5,163,000.

Considering the manufacturers' schedule under the present tariff law, we find it cost the farmers of Illinois \$40,000,000 and it cost the balance of the population of Illinois \$205,000,000, making the total cost to the people of Illinois \$225,000,000. The farmers alone in the State of Illinois under the schedules of the present tariff lost \$67 for every dollar they gained, while the people of Illinois lost \$414 for every dollar they gained. That is what Mr. Wallace, son of the former Secretary of Agriculture, meant when he said that the farmers of the United States as a whole had lost \$50 every time they gained \$1 under the present tariff law.

Taking all three of the States mentioned, we find that the gain from the agricultural tariff was \$4,756,000 while it cost \$16,749,000. The nonagricultural population lost \$66,546,000. Considering the agricultural schedules alone we find that the farmers of the three States of Indiana, Ohio, and Illinois lost \$12,000,000. When we consider the manufacturing schedule as it affected the people of those three States we find it cost the farmers alone \$113,617,000 and it cost the nonfarming population of those three States \$500,928,000, making a total cost to the three States of practically \$615,000,000.

The farmers of the three States mentioned lost \$20 every time they gained \$1, while the people in all three of those States lost \$130 every time they gained \$1.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. Has the Senator the figures as to the amounts lost to the farmers by reason of the tariff on farm products throughout the United States?

Mr. BARKLEY. No. I have them for 14 States. I have not been able to obtain them for all of the States. I am going to proceed now to give the results for 14 States, including the 3 which I have just mentioned.

Mr. FRAZIER. Of course, the figures were given to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry several times and have been stated on the floor of the Senate, showing that practically the average loss to the farmer below the cost of production on the products he sold was \$6,500,000,000 a year. If he lost more than that amount by the tariff, it would offset the gain he made upon the sale of his products.

Mr. BARKLEY. The two propositions are intertwined. Part of that \$6,500,000,000 net loss to which the Senator refers consists of the increased costs which are figured in the net loss to the farmer as compared to what he gained.

Let us take now the 14 States which may be said to be fairly representative and typical of the whole country and ascertain what the effect has been upon them. I refer to the three previously mentioned—Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois—and to Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Washington, Wisconsin, Oregon, and Texas.

We find that for those 14 States as a whole the tariff on farm products produced a gain to the farmers of \$21,170,000, while it cost them \$56,459,000. In Ohio every time the people gained \$1 as a result of the tariff they lost \$14. That is only the agricultural tariff of which I am speaking now. In Indiana the ratio was \$44 lost to \$1 gained. In Illinois the ratio was \$67 of loss to \$1 of gain. In Minnesota the ratio was \$9 of loss to \$1 of gain. In Wisconsin the ratio was \$51 of loss to \$1 of gain. In Iowa the ratio was \$67 of loss to \$1 of gain. In Kansas the ratio was \$118 of loss to \$1 of gain. In Nebraska the ratio was \$17 of loss to \$1 of gain. In Colorado the ratio was \$2.50 of loss to \$1 of gain. In Utah the ratio was \$2.50 of loss to \$1 of gain. In Washington the ratio was \$54 of loss to \$1 of gain. In Oregon the ratio was \$30 of loss to \$1 gain. In Idaho the ratio was \$8 of loss to \$1 gain. In Texas the ratio was \$267 of loss to \$1 of gain.

The total population of those of 14 States in 1920 was 34,666,784. The farming population of the 14 States was 11,604,923. The farm gain under the agricultural tariff was \$21,170,000, the loss was \$437,729,000, while the total cost of the present tariff law to all the people of the 14 States amounted to \$1,406,548,000.

Let us see how the increase in the tariff on farm products has affected the problem of agricultural depression. On the 6th day of March, 1926, President Coolidge increased the tariff on butter from 8 cents to 12 cents a pound. At that time butter was selling at 43.5 cents per pound in New York. By March 26, 1926, it had declined to 41 cents a pound, and on April 26 of that same year it sold for 37½ cents per pound, notwithstanding the fact that the President had increased the tariff from 8 cents to 12 cents per pound only a few weeks before. Can anyone contend that such an increase in the tariff on butter is any part of a solution of the agricultural problem which confronted the people of the Nation either then or now?

I do not call attention to these fluctuations, Mr. President, for any partisan purpose. I call attention to them merely to demonstrate that no kind of tariff legislation we can enact will solve the farmer's problem at this time or make any appreciable contribution to its solution. The reason why I deem it pertinent to discuss this phase of the agricultural situation is because in addition to the provisions of the bill now under consideration in the Senate it is proposed to deal with the agricultural tariff as a coordinate branch of our legislation designed to help agriculture in the United States.

The farmers of America are not concerned about the small maneuvers of politicians seeking to put other politicians in a hole. The farmers of America know that they are in a hole and that this hole has been growing deeper from year to year. It would be nothing short of criminal for men in positions of responsibility to use the farmers' plight to advance themselves or to embarrass their enemies. Therefore I have not called attention to these fluctuating prices of agricultural products for any reason except to show that the remedy for the farmer is not in a higher tariff on his basic product, and it certainly can not be in a higher tariff on the products he does not produce. I have called attention to them to show that if the American farmer is to be given any relief under the tariff it must be done in some other way than by raising the rates, however much they help to meet the situation with reference to other products which may be affected by a definite rate.

In other words, if the farmer of the United States is to be aided by any tariff legislation or by a consideration of the tariff in connection with his problem, it can not be done alone by raising the rates on agricultural products, but it must be done in some other way, so as to make the tariff effective to bring benefits to him. If he is to be benefited in any way by the tariff, it must be done by some arrangement by which he can be relieved of at least a portion of the burden he is bearing for the benefit of others and made able to receive a portion of it back into his own pocket.

(At this point Mr. BARKLEY yielded to Mr. SHORTRIDGE to submit a unanimous-consent request, which appears after the conclusion of Mr. BARKLEY's speech.)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was calling attention to the combination of proposals that have been offered and which are to be offered as a solution of the farm problem, one being the bill now under consideration, with or without the so-called debenture plan, and the other a subsequent proposal in the nature of an increase in the tariff on agricultural products.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield before he enters upon that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I want to ask the Senator before he enters upon that phase of the discussion whether his argument against the protective tariff on agricultural products would extend to a repeal of the tariff on such products?

Mr. BARKLEY. No, sir. In the first place, I will say to the Senator that he evidently misconstrues the object of my remarks. I am not advocating and would not vote for the repeal of the tariff on agricultural products. As I stated a while ago, I may even vote for an increase of the tariff on agricultural products; but my contention is that no tariff we can place on the basic agricultural commodities the depression in which has produced the farm situation can bring an appreciable contribution to a solution of the agricultural problem which brings us here.

Mr. FESS. I understood from the statement of the Senator when he referred to the prices of butter that he regarded the protection afforded butter as of no value.

Mr. BARKLEY. I referred to butter simply as an evidence of the fact that the President's efforts to bring about better conditions in agriculture by an increase of 8 cents a pound in the tariff on butter had produced no results, but that in spite of that tariff butter went down from 43½ to 37¼ cents a pound.

Mr. FESS. If the Senator will yield further, I desire to suggest to him that the Underwood law, as the Senator will recall, placed a good many of the commodities produced by the farmer on the free list, and subsequent legislation put them on the dutiable list. I was wondering whether the Senator's argument was along the line of the Underwood law in placing agricultural commodities on the free list.

Mr. BARKLEY. No, sir; I am not arguing the abstract question of the propriety of a tariff on any particular commodity. I am undertaking to show that the efforts to solve the farm problem by a tariff on any farm product is not sufficiently effective for us to look to it with any degree of hope, and that, therefore, some other method must be employed in order to solve the agricultural problem for the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky believes that the protective tariff does not in any way assist the product I should think he would not want to maintain the expense that goes with the protective tariff, but would vote to take it off.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not stated, and I do not state, that a tariff on an agricultural product can not in any way affect the price of the product; I have admitted freely that there are a number of agricultural products upon which a tariff may be effective, but those products do not happen to be in the category of agricultural products the depression in which has produced the alarming situation which we are trying to cure by our legislation. Therefore, levying a tariff on them so high as to keep out all competition would still leave the farm problem practically unsolved, and, therefore, we must resort to some other expedient in order to relieve the situation to any effectual degree.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PHIPPS. I desire to ask the Senator from Kentucky if he gave the dates on which the price of 43½ cents on butter prevailed in New York and the date at which it was reduced to 37¼ cents per pound? I did not catch the dates.

Mr. BARKLEY. I gave those dates.

Mr. PHIPPS. Then, I shall not trouble the Senator to give them again if they are already in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. They will appear in my remarks. I gave the exact date on which the President raised the tariff and the date on which the commodity sold at a lower figure.

Therefore, Mr. President, as I was saying a while ago, we have the bill now pending before the Senate, with or without the debenture plan; then we have in the offing the prospect of a tariff bill which it is supposed will have some effect on the agricultural situation in the United States. I have demonstrated, at least, to my satisfaction, whether or not to the satisfaction of any other Senator, that no kind of tariff legislation affecting agricultural products can make any appreciable contribution to the solution of the farm problem that now confronts the people. If I am correct in assuming that no amount of tariff legislation as to agricultural products will bring the relief the farmer needs, the situation will be intensified by what I presume is the object in raising the tariff on other things that he must buy so as to make it still more burdensome upon him than it is even now under the present tariff law. Of course, however, that is more or less speculative, because we are not permitted to see what is "in the lap of the gods" respecting the tariff on manufactured products or anything else.

Then what is the remedy? I presume no man, however learned he might be, would claim that he has the last word on the subject of agricultural relief. We have all been trying to find our way in the dark on this subject, and no man is necessarily subject to the charge of being inconsistent merely because he has voted differently on different occasions. It has been my opinion, and is yet my opinion, that the two bills vetoed by President Coolidge offered the best prospect of real assistance in helping the farmer work out his problem, but those bills are not before us now and we must consider the proposals that are before us. I am frank in the belief that the so-called administration measure, sponsored by the House of Representatives and the President, is not sufficient to offer any substantial aid to American agriculture. In saying this I do not question either the sincerity or the good faith of the President or any Member of either branch of Congress whose views may differ from mine. I take it for granted that every man in a position of responsibility tries to follow the light afforded by his intellect and his conscience. That is the guide which I attempt to set for myself, and I have no disposition to question the motives of other men equally as sincere and equally as able.

But what are we offered? We are offered a farm board and a revolving fund, which is to be loaned to cooperative farm organizations if there are any left to take advantage of it. It has been my belief that what the farmer needed was not an opportunity to borrow more money. He has already borrowed all he has any security to guarantee, and probably much more than he will ever be able to repay.

Furthermore, there are not at present anywhere in the United States a sufficient number of cooperative marketing associations covering a sufficient area or a sufficient number of clubs to make this additional credit facility of any real value. There is no national wheat cooperative organization and few local ones. The tobacco organizations, which existed for a while, have practically ceased to function, and this provision of the bill will be of no earthly benefit to the tobacco growers of the United States unless it were possible to reorganize the tobacco associations, which possibility I seriously doubt. There is no nation-wide and few local cooperative organizations for cotton, corn, rice, pork, or any other farm product which form a considerable part of the farm problem with which we are dealing, and, in my opinion, it will be impossible to form any such comprehensive organizations as will be able to deal with any nation-wide farm product in the near future.

Therefore the so-called revolving of \$500,000,000 constitutes a mere gesture. About all it will be able to do will be to revolve in the Treasury, but none of its revolutions will take any considerable portion of it into the regions of the country where the farm conditions are so distressing.

The same thing may be said of the stabilization corporations provided for under the bill. They are to be operated and under control of the cooperative marketing associations, and if there are no such associations now in existence and if no reasonable expectation can be entertained of their possible organization in the near future, then this provision of the bill is equally futile. Therefore the bill as proposed by the administration constitutes an empty shell, within which there is no substance. It affords a glittering mirage to the parched tongue of agriculture which disappears in hot air upon closer approach.

Unless there shall be cooperative marketing associations for cotton, tobacco, wheat, corn, rice, and the other basic commodities the depression in which has produced this problem which we are trying to find a way to solve, then the farm board and the revolving fund, in my honest judgment, will be of no practical benefit to the millions of producers of wheat, corn, pork, tobacco, cotton, rice, and the other commodities of nationwide importance in scope and territory, the depression in which has largely produced the condition which we are attempting to remedy.

Therefore, Mr. President, if the tariff alone will not solve the problem of the farmer, if this empty shell of a farm board, with \$500,000,000, with nobody to loan it to, will not solve the farm problem, what is there left of this legislation that will help him? I am frank to say that I voted for the equalization fee in the original McNary-Haugen bill. I voted for it as a Member of the other body before I became a Member of the Senate. I voted for the equalization fee in the last Congress as a Member of this body. I voted for it because I believed then, as I believe now, that it is the wisest, the most substantial proposal that has yet been offered to work out the problems of the farmer as they now exist and is the only instance that has ever come to my knowledge where any large group of the American people have come to Congress asking for remedial legislation and as a basis and foundation for the granting of that legislation have offered to pay their own losses out of their own pockets and not out of the Treasury or out of the pockets of somebody else in the

United States. Other groups have come here and ask for legislation affecting their special condition, and many of them have asked that their losses be borne by the Government of the United States; but when the farmers of the Nation came here and asked for the legislation embodied in the McNary-Haugen bill, vetoed twice by President Coolidge, they made the unique and original proposal that if there were any losses sustained as a result of the legislation they would bear those losses out of their own pockets and not out of the pockets of others.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And the equalization fee constituted a natural and effective restriction of overproduction.

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Under it if overproduction occurred those who produced in excess would have to stand the losses resulting from it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Absolutely; and I challenge any Senator on this floor to point to legislation asked for by any other considerable group of American people where they have made a proposal so fair and so just, not only to the people of the country but to the Treasury of the United States. But, of course, we have a situation here now where the equalization fee and the original McNary-Haugen bill have been McNaryized and de-Haugenized. We have left a farm board and a revolving fund which in my judgment will revolve only in the Treasury and never revolve out into the remote places of this country so that the farmers will get any benefit even from the \$500,000,000 which it is proposed to loan to them, upon which loans probably the farmers have no additional security that they can offer as a guaranty for its repayment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely want to ask the Senator if the farmers could not have had all that this bill minus the debenture plan now offers them at any time within the last three years if the Congress had then been disposed to give it to them, as it seems now disposed to give it to them? In other words, could not this bill with the debenture plan eliminated have been passed by the Congress and even approved by Mr. Coolidge long before Mr. Hoover's election?

Mr. BARKLEY. It could have been, yes, if Congress had been disposed to pass it; but if it had been passed three years ago, or at the time the first McNary-Haugen bill was voted on, either in the Senate or in the other body, I doubt very seriously whether the farm problem would have been very different at this time from what it is now.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but the point to which I wish to draw the Senator's attention is that we have been called in extra session to provide farm relief, and the only thing the administration offers is substantially what was unopposed by any party or any group within the Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator from Georgia might go further and say that throughout the entire period of agitation concerning this subject, since 1921, there has never been an hour when there would have been any serious objection to the passage of this measure except upon the ground that it was wholly inadequate.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the point I wished to make.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; of course there has been no time in the last eight years when the party that happens unfortunately to be in control of the Government could not have passed a proposition like the one we have before us now if the debenture plan is to be eliminated; and it was, of course, the duty of the party in power to do that at least, or something better, because in 1920 they promised to do something for the farmer, although the problem was not acute in 1920, because they were not in power.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I think the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Georgia also, and, for that matter, even my good friend the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]—

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator, by that reference, is not alluding to the Senator from Georgia or to me as not being his good friends also.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No, Mr. President; they are all good friends of mine, but the Senator from Arkansas is especially my good friend. I have great affection for him; and so I say that even he, it seems to me, as well as the other two gentlemen, have overlooked the fact that an election was held within the last six months, and this question was an issue, and the people have passed upon it, and that is why we are now considering this particular bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky further yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. That statement has been made repeatedly during the course of this debate, but I challenge the accuracy of the conclusion, namely, that in the last national election there was a referendum respecting the subject of farm legislation and that the voters of the country decided against the principle of the equalization fee.

There is not a Senator who hears me who does not know that in large sections of the country other issues than that pertaining to farm relief constituted the controlling factors in the election.

In the West and Middle West and in some sections of the South, where the subject of farm relief was of great interest, I maintain with confidence that the result of that election shows or tends to show that the farmers of the country were in sympathy with the principle of the legislation heretofore passed by the Congress and vetoed by the President of the United States. There never was an election since I have been in politics in which the Democratic national ticket received more cordial and enthusiastic support in several agricultural States that usually are overwhelmingly Republican than was received during the last campaign, and it was the result of a contrast between the principle asserted by the Republican Party and that advocated by the Democratic Party.

The farmers of the West and Middle West did not defeat the Democratic Party on account of its position relating to the farm question. Two of the big issues that controlled that election, and of far greater influence in the result of the election than the agricultural issue, pertained to national prohibition and alleged "religious freedom." Millions of men and women who voted in that election scarcely took into consideration the question of farm relief, and it is fallacious to assume or to assert that as a result of that election those who believe in substantial, fair, impartial, and just relief to the men who constitute the farmers of this Nation are estopped from performing their duty or estopped from doing what they think is right and necessary because of an adverse decision by referendum on the subject. There has been no referendum on the subject.

Ask the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], who was one of the most potent factors in the last campaign, whether he thinks the campaign was determined on the basis of the farm problem. Ask yourselves that question and answer it honestly and intelligently, and we will not hear again the assertion that it is a repudiation of the decision of the electorate to insist upon anything that Mr. Hoover does not advocate touching the subject of farm relief. His speeches, both his acceptance speech and his campaign speeches, were so general, so indefinite that it is exceedingly difficult now, in the light of the events that have transpired since the election, to determine what provisions he advocated for enactment into law.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say, supplementing what the Senator from Arkansas has said, that if it had not been for the fright created in the bosom of the Republican candidate for President by the contrast between his position and the position of the Democratic Party on agriculture that induced him to make a promise to call an extra session this session would not now be here dealing with agricultural problems.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And who prompted the calling of the extra session?

Mr. BARKLEY. Why, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is largely responsible for the existence of this extra session. During the campaign he heard thundering throughout the West the mutterings of the farmers of this Nation; he heard the measured tread of the farmers as they started toward the polls; and he said, "O Mr. Hoover, promise them an extraordinary session of Congress! True, the Republicans have been in absolute power throughout the last eight years. True, they promised in two successive platforms to place agriculture on an equality with other industries, and the fact that they have

repeated their promise is proof conclusive that they never kept it. But now, unless you do promise them an extra session, we are going to lose the farmers' vote"; and the candidate announced that he would call an extraordinary session of Congress in obedience to the demand of the warrior from Idaho, and we are in session; and when we first assembled neither the Senator from Idaho nor the President had worked out the details of the plan to be incorporated in the bill for farm relief.

Every Senator here knows that the declaration is true; and now we hear that because Mr. Hoover was elected on a promise to call an extra session of Congress and do something which his party had failed or refused to do throughout eight years of complete power, we ought not to discuss the issue, we ought to do what the President and Mr. BORAH say; and, if I am not mistaken, I am going to do a part of that thing, advance with the Senator from Idaho in the shaping of this bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. BORAH. I trust that my colleagues do not feel any particular anger toward me for the small part I played in the calling of the extra session.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I hope the Senator does not infer any anger on my part from anything I have said, or from any manner that I have employed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think we should all be grateful to the Senator from Idaho, and I desire to express my gratitude to him for his influence—his compelling influence, his indispensable influence—in the production of this extra session, for without him I doubt seriously whether we would be here now considering the farmer, even remotely.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not want any misunderstanding about that. I do not go so strong as that on this extra session. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. What I referred to was his influence in having it called. I am not speaking about what it is going to do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON]; and while I do not desire to take the Senator's time, because I shall have some time of my own a little later, I was somewhat surprised to hear the Senator say that the farm question was not one of the principal things that went to the country, one of the principal issues in the last campaign.

As I remember, Mr. President, the national chairman of the Democratic Party, Mr. Raskob, was represented by the press, at any rate, as setting aside \$500,000 to be used in connection with the Democratic platform's pledge for farm relief in the Middle West alone; and all over the country that issue went to the people, and both of the candidates for President, the Republican candidate and the Democratic candidate, and the candidates for Vice President—the distinguished gentleman who now sits in the chair and my distinguished friend from Arkansas—also plead with the people of the country on that issue, farm relief—two planks.

The Republican platform provided for one plan, and Mr. Hoover was practically unanimously nominated by that convention on that platform, chose to stand on that platform, went to the people on that platform, declared himself time and again on the principles of that platform, and so declares himself at this moment.

The Democratic candidate, who was heretofore the distinguished Governor of New York, had quite a time with his farm relief. He went to the country, by radio and otherwise, on the Democratic farm plan, and everybody was drafted into the service of both parties who could discuss that question. Finally, the people decided in November of last year. They decided for the plan of Herbert Hoover. Herbert Hoover did promise to call a special session of Congress. Herbert Hoover kept his word. We are here now as a result of that promise. Never has he made a promise in all the course of his life that he has not kept. The American people have confidence in Herbert Hoover. All the people have confidence in Herbert Hoover. The people in the Senator's own State believe in Herbert Hoover. The people in Kentucky, to the extent of 178,000 majority, believed in Herbert Hoover. Almost did Herbert Hoover carry the great State of Arkansas. And the people of this country believe in Hoover just as much now as ever before in the history of Mr. Hoover's public career.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The House has adopted this plan, which comes over here to us now, which I think is in some respects better than the Senate plan for farm relief, and it has the indorsement of Herbert Hoover. It is consistent with his platform utterances. It is consistent with the Republican platform, and the people expect that program to be put into effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana twice voted in this body for the equalization fee. He went before the people of Indiana last year. He was reelected. Was his reelection to be construed as an indorsement of his record in voting on that subject, if it was an issue in Indiana, or a repudiation of the Senator's position?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I went to the people of Indiana in practically all the counties and indorsed Herbert Hoover and the Republican platform. I am willing to abide by the expression of the majority of my State and of the Union.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the Senator condemns his own record in the Senate on two votes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No, Mr. President; the equalization fee was only one of many remedies proposed. It was here, I voted for it, and I was glad to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was the only one indorsed by agriculture. The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. That was the only one upon which the Senator from Indiana had voted twice as a member of this body, and therefore he can not contend that his own record was repudiated by the people of Indiana merely because they voted for Mr. Hoover.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. In the amazing spectacle which the Senate has just witnessed we see conclusive proof of the accuracy of my statement. Here is a Senator who, prior to the Republican convention, stood for exactly what is not in this bill, and stood firm. Now he tells us that the election constituted a referendum on the subject of the two platforms, and that the people decided with Mr. Hoover, and that the people of Arkansas came near deciding for Mr. Hoover.

It happens to be true, Mr. President, that the Democratic national ticket in Arkansas last year received the largest majority that was ever accorded a Democratic national ticket in that State in the history of the party. That feature of the Senator's statement is on a par with the general accuracy of the declaration made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON].

Of course the farm question was made an issue in the last campaign. Of course it was discussed. But when the astute statesman and leader, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] saw that Mr. Hoover's position on the subject was unpopular, and that the Democrats were going to carry the West and Middle West on that issue unless something radical and unusual were done, he appealed to his candidate to declare that an extra session would be called for the purpose of settling this controversy, and it was upon that appeal, and the response made to it by Mr. Hoover, who pledged an extra session of Congress for farm relief—thereby admitting that his party had failed to keep its pledges throughout eight years of complete power—it was under those circumstances that the election was held, and, while not disputing that the farm issue was in the campaign, I will say now what is known to every intelligent man who hears me, that the dominating issues of the campaign, those which attracted the most attention and aroused the greatest excitement, were not the farm problem. They were the other questions which I have already named.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is also true that, notwithstanding the fact that the Republican nominee for President promised during the last few days of the campaign to call an extra session to deal with farm legislation, notwithstanding these other issues to which the Senator from Arkansas has referred, it is true that in States like Minnesota, Wisconsin, the Dakotas, Nebraska, Iowa, and other States the Democratic ticket last year received a larger vote, although it did not carry those States, than it had received in any presidential campaign in recent years.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, the Senator and the Senator from Arkansas will both admit, I take it, that Herbert Hoover did carry 40 of the 48 States.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. There is no doubt about Mr. Hoover's election. There is no doubt on that subject.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to take up the thread of my discussion where it was broken with reference to the bill now before us, with special emphasis on the so-called farm board and revolving fund theory, and also the debenture plan.

I am willing to vote to retain the debenture plan in this measure. I voted, I think, against the debenture plan in the last Congress as a substitute for the equalization fee, and if I were called on to cast a vote under the same circumstances now I would cast the same vote that I cast in the last Congress. I think it was offered as a substitute, though as to that I may be in error.

The question now before us is the debenture plan as an addition to the plan of the administration, so called, if it can be said to be a plan, and in that circumstance I propose to vote to retain the debenture plan in this bill as reported from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The Senator just said that he voted against the debenture plan when it was offered as an alternative to the equalization fee. He also voted against the debenture on the 21st day of May, 1928, when it was offered by Senator Reed, of Missouri, as an amendment to the tax bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I think I did.

Mr. FESS. What has changed the Senator that he is now for the thing against which he voted then?

Mr. BARKLEY. I tried to explain before the Senator rose that if this were a controversy between the debenture plan and the equalization fee I would still vote against the debenture as a substitute for the equalization fee.

Mr. FESS. But it is not a substitute.

Mr. BARKLEY. The amendment was offered by the Senator from Missouri without any discussion as an amendment to a tax bill, which I voted against because it was an amendment to a tax bill. It was not germane to the subject under consideration, and frequently Members of the Senate vote against propositions that are wholly extraneous to the legislation under consideration when they might cast a different vote if the subject were up on its own merits as an independent proposition.

Mr. FESS. Does the Senator mean that he believed in the principle of debenture and voted against it then?

Mr. BARKLEY. I would not say that I either believed in it or did not believe in it at that time. I voted against it as a substitute for the equalization plan. I voted against it as an amendment to a tax bill because it had no business in a tax bill, and even if the Senator desires to convict me of inconsistency in my votes, I will say frankly that I had not given very serious consideration to the debenture plan at that time, and that might have entered into the motive that actuated me in casting my vote. But as a part and parcel of the legislation now under consideration I have given it sufficient consideration to enable me to vote for it with a clear conscience, because I am convinced that it is the only plan now under consideration that will offer any relief to the farmers of the United States.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield further to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not desire when I rose to occupy the whole day myself, and while I am willing to yield further, I do not want unnecessarily to do so, so as to deprive other Senators of the opportunity of speaking. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FESS. I do not indict the Senator because at one time he voted for it and another time voted against it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether the Senator was present when I began my remarks or not. I stated that the charge of inconsistency could not properly lie at the door of any Senator, for we have for several years been feeling our way in the dark on this question, and what might have appeared last week as a wise solution might to-day appear foolish, and vice versa.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I think I agree with the Senator in that statement. The only thing I had in mind was that I have known the Senator for many years, and have known him to be a man of rare mental integrity, who does not change his view unless there is some reason for doing so. That is why I asked the Senator the question, because I remembered very distinctly his vote against the debenture plan on the 21st of May, 1928.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not undertake to deny or conceal that vote. I voted against it on another occasion, too, I think, either here or in the other body, as a substitute for the equalization fee, but I am not in any way bound by those votes, which were cast under circumstances wholly foreign to the situation which confronts us now.

Mr. President, if I am correct in assuming, as I did at the outset, that an increase in tariff rates on agricultural products, however beneficial it may be in a special and limited sense, is not a solution of the farm problem; if the creation of a farm

board and the creation of a revolving fund, which can only function through organizations that now do not exist, and in all probability can not be created, is not the solution, then the debenture plan is the only plan left for us to consider in connection with any possible relief in the agricultural situation of the country.

It has been objected by so high an authority as the President that to keep this provision in the bill will result in an increase in the price of farm products now in the hands of merchants and exporters and others who are in the business of buying and selling farm products. I am not prepared to deny that that statement is true, but the same thing will happen as to the price of manufactured products when you bring in a tariff bill increasing the tariff duties on imports of those particular products into markets of the United States. If you bring in a tariff bill increasing the tariff on sugar, or on steel, or on textiles, it will automatically increase the price of the products in the hands of anybody—manufacturer, jobber, or merchant. If it should happen in the case of manufactured products, I ask you in all sincerity whether that objection lies in good faith to any increase that might be brought about in farm-product prices by the adoption of the debenture plan as proposed in this legislation; and if it be true that such an increase would occur, would not the increase be immediately reflected in the price to the producer, not only for what he might have on hand, but what he would produce in the future?

It has been objected to on the ground that it is a subsidy, and I am as fundamentally against subsidies, I imagine, as any Member of the Senate. But when we give into the hands of a few men, either rightfully or wrongfully—and I am not now discussing the merits of that proposition—when we give into the hands of a few men in certain sections of the country the power to use this taxing function of government to enrich themselves at the expense of others, and to make an added profit out of government, then I say that to all intents and purposes it is as much a subsidy as if that amount of money were taken out of the Treasury itself and put in their pockets. Do we desire the tariff to be really effective for the benefit of the farmer?

The administration bill makes no pretense to undertake this effort. I do not contend that this bill will not, in the long run, add something to the knowledge of agriculture in general for the benefit of agriculture in the years to come. Whether the farm board, set up, will do any greater work along this line than is being done by the Department of Agriculture and other agricultural facilities of the Government remains to be seen. But the most enthusiastic supporter of this measure, as it passed the House, will not claim that this measure will to any appreciable degree relieve the farmer of the unequal load which I have been describing. The only proposal now before the Senate that undertakes to do this is the export-debenture plan. This plan proposes to allow the farmer to draw back an amount equal to one-half the present tariff on the products which compete with his exportable surplus.

It is claimed that this is a subsidy. If it is a subsidy it is only a small portion of the subsidy which the Government allows other industries to impose upon the people. It is claimed that this plan will reduce the receipts of the Treasury, or that it is money taken from the Treasury. This can not be true because the amount by which the farmer will be benefited never reaches the Treasury, and it will be an easy matter to adjust tariff schedules so as to produce no decrease in annual revenues. But even if it be properly described as a subsidy the Republican Party can not consistently object to it on that account for it has been only a few years ago since one of its administrations, in the very midst of an agricultural panic, proposed a subsidy to the shipping interests of this country, which would have cost the people, out of the Treasury, \$750,000,000, and many of the Senators on this floor, who now choke at a modest bounty for agriculture, voted for that subsidy to the Shipping Trust.

They were not then so outspoken against subsidies. One of your administrations brought in a proposal in 1923 to grant to the Shipping Trust of the United States a subsidy that would have amounted to \$750,000,000 in a period of 10 years. There are on the floor of the Senate to-day men who voted to take out of the Treasury \$750,000,000 to give to the Shipping Trust as a subsidy, and they did it without hesitation, and yet they choke to-day because we are proposing to allow the farmer to get back probably a very small percentage of the amount which he is taxed, directly and indirectly, for the benefit of those who have been able to raise the cost of his supplies to such an extent that he every year contributes \$1,000,000,000 to this policy. It has been estimated that if all the agricultural products which are affected by a tariff and would be eligible for debenture privileges should take advantage of the bill it would not amount to as much as \$100,000,000 a year, and that is only one-tenth of

the amount that is involved in the increased cost to agriculture by reason of the conditions to which I have been referring this afternoon.

I can not for the life of me understand how any Member of Congress can vote to give to the Shipping Trust \$750,000,000 out of the Treasury of the United States but can not vote to allow the farmer to have at least a portion of the burden he bears relieved by the only legislation which can make the tariff effective so far as pending legislation is concerned. By a proper adjustment of tariff rates there need be no loss to the Treasury by reason of the debenture plan which is now before the Senate.

The objection has been made that this plan will increase the value of farm products now in the hands of private corporations. This may be true, but the increase will be reflected in the value of farm products now in the hands of farmers or which may be hereafter produced. You are proposing in a few weeks to increase the tariff on certain manufactured products, and I am not passing now on the question whether such increases are wise or unwise, proper or improper, but I do make the statement that any increase in the tariff on manufactured goods will increase the value of such goods now on hand as well as that to be produced in the future. If it is preposterous to increase the value of farm products by immediate legislation, what is it that makes this policy virtuous when applied to manufactured goods? The export debenture is objected to on the ground that it is economically unsound, and so it may be; who knows? But what sort of a yardstick are we to measure the economic soundness or unsoundness of any proposal? Nothing could be more unsound economically, politically, or morally than the policy which has produced the conditions now confronting agriculture. We are all groping more or less in the dark, seeking a remedy, and we hope by our experience to find one. If one proposal that may be economically unsound is offered as an antidote to other policies which are equally unsound, and which have produced the unsound conditions which we are seeking to remedy, who is there great enough and wise enough to condemn the effort by a mere anathema?

I am going to vote for this bill as it has been reported from the Senate committee, which contains the debenture plan. If this portion of the bill shall be eliminated I shall then vote for the best bill I can get, hoping for the best and fearing the worst, whatever may be its fate elsewhere.

During the delivery of Mr. BARKLEY's speech—

Mr. SHORTTRIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me in order that I may make a request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PATTERSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. SHORTTRIDGE. I have been furnished with much authoritative data as to wage scales in industrial employment, including agriculture, prevailing in practically all the countries of the world. I ask leave to have this information published as a Senate document. I think it will be useful to Members of the Senate and the House during the session, and particularly in connection with legislation now under consideration by the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the Senator from California who has furnished him with the data to which he refers?

Mr. SHORTTRIDGE. Immediately, I may say, our Secretary of Labor, and he in turn has had recourse to authoritative reports coming through the Department of State from our consuls and business agents the world over, and from official documents. The wage scales have been converted into American currency, so that it can be seen at a glance the wages paid to labor in the different countries the world over.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I do not think the Senator from California should have interrupted the Senator from Kentucky—

Mr. SHORTTRIDGE. I did so because I had to leave the Chamber.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. In the midst of his address to ask this leave. I shall, therefore, object for the present.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to its going in, provided the whole proceeding concerning it shall be printed at the end of my remarks and not in the midst of them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas objects to the request.

Mr. SHORTTRIDGE. I very much regret that the Senator objects now, as I am leaving the Chamber.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Is the Senator leaving the city?

Mr. SHORTTRIDGE. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. As the Senator is leaving the city, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. SHORTTRIDGE. I thank both the Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the matter will be printed as a document.

After the conclusion of Mr. BARKLEY's speech,

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for any great length of time with a presentation of my views on the pending question. All of us are agreed there is a farm problem. Both political parties have made the statement in their platforms. The issue has gone to the people and I think everybody now concedes its existence. The question presenting itself to us is a solution of the problem known to exist.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator said the problem had gone to the people. A few moments ago when he interrupted the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] he said there had been a great referendum and that there could be no question about the result. I merely wanted to ask the Senator if he knew that nearly one-third of the members of his own party in the Senate do not think as he does about the result of that referendum?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question I need only to say that the question went to the people of his own State, the great State of Tennessee, and it was decided there. I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. McKELLAR. There was no farm question submitted to the people of Tennessee.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, so far as I am personally concerned, like every other Member of this body, I am anxious to find a solution that will improve conditions in the agricultural industry. I think several things will help solve the problem. There is no doubt in my mind that the tariff will assist. I believe in a protective tariff on farm commodities in order that the American producer may be protected against the producers abroad who can produce their crops for much less money than it costs in this country to produce similar crops.

The President of the United States believes that too, as he has stated time and again. I believe also the development of our internal waterways will have much to do with the solution of the problem. I think when the great Mississippi system from Chicago to the Gulf and the canal or seaway from Chicago to the Atlantic Ocean are opened up and put into effect they will mean a difference of anywhere from 7 to 10 cents a bushel on wheat alone in favor of the American farmer, especially in the West, Middle West, and Northwest. But there must be some Federal instrumentality provided that can give its entire attention to agriculture throughout the years to come to the end that we may develop in course of time a great national farm policy. That the legislation now before this body proposes to do.

It is of utmost importance, too, in my opinion, that legislation be enacted at the earliest possible moment if the farmers of America are to benefit from it to any degree this year. Because of that fact, time is of the essence. The question before the Senate then is to decide what is the best plan that may be adopted at this moment.

The House of Representatives has passed the bill. I stated a while ago that in some respects I like the bill passed by the House better than the one which is before us here. For instance, I like the idea of a board composed of fewer members. I think it would be more cohesive. There can be a meeting of minds more easily, as a result of which the great problems which will confront us this year and in the years to come can be studied more efficiently and there can be better coordination.

Then both the bill here and the one passed at the other end of the Capitol provide that the chairman of the board may be a man who can be paid any salary the President of the United States decides is reasonable under the circumstances. That will enable the Government to go out into the country and find the very best man, regardless of how big he may be, how well qualified he may be, and regardless of what he may be worth from the standpoint of salary, to place in charge of this great work.

Mr. President, my chief reason for standing here now is to refute some statements that have been made during the course of the debate. I do not believe I could add anything much to what has been said and I do not suppose any Member of this body will be persuaded by anything I may say to vote one way or another. But it is proper for me to express my opinion as well as for other Members of the Senate to express theirs.

I am opposed to the debenture plan at this time for the reasons cited by the President in his very admirable answer to the

communication of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and for the additional reason that in my opinion the farmers of the country themselves are opposed to it. The farmers of the country themselves believe that the plan proposed by President Hoover should be enacted into law and given a trial.

The proposed legislation provides that the Federal farm board shall report back to the Congress with suggestions of methods for still further developing farm relief and bringing it more thoroughly to realization.

Of course, legislation is all experimental. This legislation will be experimental. If the pending bill is enacted into law, we shall find methods for its improvement as the years go by. It will necessarily be amended; there is no doubt of that. It will have weaknesses as well as strong points, but the weaknesses can be corrected in the course of years, and, in my opinion, it is a start in the right direction. We shall have established a board that will give its entire time to the great problems of agriculture, not only those that confront us now but those that will continue to arise and confront us in the future. During all those years the board, composed of high-grade men selected by the President of the United States—and everyone in this body knows that he will select high-grade men well qualified for the work they are called upon to do—will be sitting here or traveling throughout the country when necessary to continue to find methods for improving rural conditions in America, and in the course of five years, I predict, if this legislation is enacted into law at this time, we shall have done what should have been done half a century ago. We shall have developed a great national farm policy, and that question then will be settled for all time.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. I would like to ask the Senator from Indiana what is going to happen to the thousands and thousands of farmers who are now holding onto their land through the leniency of their creditors, which is undoubtedly the case, in the four or five years it will take to put into operation this farm bill which he states is advocated by the President, as I think it is?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, the Senator's sympathy for the American farmer is no greater than that which I feel. I lived in the country until I was a man. I know that conditions are bad. But my belief is that the minute the legislation is enacted and signed by the President conditions will at once get better. The psychology of the situation will be better in the country. The farmers of America will see that their Government is interested in their problem and is seeking to effect a solution. Therefore I would not at this time attempt to restrict the Federal farm board with a highly technical plan of any kind.

I am anxious that we shall pass a bill providing plenty of money. We provide \$500,000,000 in a revolving fund and \$500,000 as a fund for the administration of the law. I am anxious to give the board plenty of power, and then say to the board of high-grade men, "You understand the question perhaps better than any others in the world, because you have lived close to it all these years. Go out and solve this problem. Use any plan you find to solve it. You may make mistakes in attempting to find an early solution. That is to be expected. Make as few mistakes as possible, but solve the problem. Then report back to the Congress next December what more you need and we will give you additional authority if it becomes necessary." Then we shall have afforded some relief immediately to the agricultural industry and as the years go on we shall continue to perfect that relief, making conditions better and better through additional legislation. I grant that it may not be done in a moment. It is, however, better late than never. Let us make the start, and let us make it before the crop season is over this year.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FRAZIER. The Senator from Indiana states that he is in favor of a bill that will authorize the appointment of a Federal farm board and give that board wide authority to work out a complete plan. I should like to ask the Senator if he understands that either the House bill or the Senate bill will give the board that opportunity under the present situation? For instance, if the debenture plan shall be cut out of the measure, will it then give the board the power to put the debenture plan into operation if they shall think it a good thing?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No; but I will answer the Senator in this way: If we should now put in the debenture plan and restrict the board to its use, and the debenture plan should fail, we would thereby still further demoralize the farmers of the country. What we want to do is to raise their morale by giving them the economic assistance to which they are entitled. Therefore, I say, let the board be organized and work on the remedies provided, and then, at the next session of Congress, suggest any additional methods for farm relief which the board may think desirable.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana further yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FRAZIER. If the present provision be retained and the debenture plan shall be left optional with the board, they will not need to put it in operation unless they shall see fit to do so.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I recognize that perfectly well, and for the present I certainly favor excluding it, because if it be retained in the measure there is always a tendency to use the first thing that comes along. Let us keep all highly technical plans out of this proposed legislation; let us create the farm board, get the law passed as quickly as possible, and start something at the earliest possible moment. Let us tell the board to work out this problem and to report back at each succeeding Congress as to what additional legislation is needed. It has wide powers, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield further to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I will yield in just a moment. The board under this proposed law will have wide powers, tremendous powers, greater powers than were ever given to any board in any legislation passed by Congress in its history. Let us eliminate for the moment highly technical plans from the proposed legislation, since in that way we shall follow the recommendation of the President of the United States, who enjoys the full confidence of the country.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator if he does not think there is at present an emergency existing in the condition of agriculture throughout the Nation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes; and I am also of the opinion that the proposed legislation now before us will cure much of the trouble that exists. It will not be perfect; I concede that; and the emergency does exist; I grant that. However, I am assuming, Mr. President, that this proposed legislation will take care of a part of that emergency. Then we shall not be tying the hands of the Federal farm board in any degree with a highly technical plan.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield further to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield further to the Senator.

Mr. FRAZIER. The Senator from Indiana has stated that he thought the psychology of the bill providing for the appointment of a Federal farm board would be good. I wish to state that, in my opinion, it will take more than psychology to meet the emergency which exists among the farmers to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. O Mr. President, I grant that; I mentioned that merely as one of the by-products for good which will flow out of the proposed legislation. It will have an excellent psychological effect on the American farmer, because he will see that after years of study and consideration and debate finally the Congress has done something; it has made a start; it has created the Federal farm board and intrusted it with tremendous powers.

Mr. FRAZIER. I want to say that I think the psychology would be good, but I do not think it would meet the present emergency.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Possibly not, but in the course of time we will bring about a better condition.

Mr. FRAZIER. But in the course of time, during two or three years, or whatever time it may take to put the legislation in operation and get it working, there would be several million more farmers go out of business because of the indebtedness they are laboring under to-day. In my opinion the only thing in this farm bill as passed by the House or the bill reported out of the Agricultural Committee of the Senate which will meet the present emergency is the debenture plan.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I disagree with the Senator as to that proposition, but it is an honest disagreement. I will say to the Senator, however, that I take issue with his statement made on the floor on one occasion during this debate to the effect that the country was forced to choose

one of two candidates. Both parties nominated their candidates practically unanimously. The country, therefore, had a choice of deciding between two candidates both of whom had been nominated practically unanimously. Then the country almost unanimously chose one of those candidates for President, and in choosing that candidate also chose the plan for farm relief of that candidate. That plan is embodied in the bill now before the Senate, with the exception of the debenture plan, which the President is against.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. I can not accept the explanation of the Senator from Indiana that the farm plan as advocated by Mr. Hoover when he was a candidate was accepted by the agricultural States of the Nation. There were a good many more issues than farm legislation in the campaign. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is true.

Mr. FRAZIER. And therefore the farm relief program was not the great issue.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No; but it was one of the big issues.

Mr. President, in that connection, what the Senator has said suggests to me that I read some of the things the President said. I think some of the quotations have previously been cited on the floor of the Senate, and I would not needlessly or tediously repeat what has been read here; but for fear it has not all been read, there are certain things I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate now. After the President of the United States had been practically unanimously nominated by his party at Kansas City, in his acceptance speech of August 11, 1928, he made the following statement:

The most urgent economic problem in our Nation to-day is in agriculture. It must be solved if we are to bring prosperity and contentment to one-third of our people directly and to all of our people indirectly. We have pledged ourselves to find a solution.

Then, turning over to another page, I read further, as follows:

It is our plain duty to search out the common ground on which we may mobilize the sound forces of agricultural reconstruction. Our platform lays a solid basis upon which we can build. It offers an affirmative program.

Mr. President, that was said at a moment when every man, woman, and child practically in the American Republic was hanging on every word that fell from the lips of the Republican candidate for President. Further, he says:

An adequate tariff is the foundation of farm relief.

That was stated at a period when everyone wanted to know his views. Further, he said:

I would use my office and influence to give the farmers the full benefit of our historic tariff policy.

And yet again:

Nature has endowed us with a great system of inland waterways. Their modernization will comprise a most substantial contribution to Mid West farm relief and to the development of 20 of our interior States. This modernization includes not only the great Mississippi system, with its joining of the Great Lakes and of the heart of Mid West agriculture to the Gulf, but also a shipway from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic. These improvements would mean so large an increment in farmers' prices as to warrant their construction many times over. There is no more vital method of farm relief.

That was the second plan of farm relief suggested by the present President in his acceptance address, when everybody was listening carefully to hear his views.

And, finally, again he said:

The platform proposes to go much further—

That is, the Republican platform—

It pledges the creation of a Federal farm board of representative farmers to be clothed with authority and resources with which not only to still further aid farmers' cooperatives and pools and to assist generally in solution of farm problems, but especially to build up with Federal finance farmer-owned and farmer-controlled stabilization corporations which will protect the farmer from the depressions and demoralization of seasonal gluts and periodical surpluses.

Objection has been made that this program, as laid down by the party platform, may require that several hundred millions of dollars of capital be advanced by the Federal Government without obligation upon the individual farmer. With that objection I have little patience. A nation which is spending ninety billions a year can well afford an ex-

penditure of a few hundred millions for a workable program that will give to one-third of its population their fair share of the Nation's prosperity. Nor does this proposal put the Government into business, except so far as it is called upon to furnish initial capital with which to build up the farmer to the control of his own destinies.

I say, Mr. President, that the pending legislation proposes that very thing, a revolving fund of \$500,000,000.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield further to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. The Senator will recall that one of the President's chief objections to the debenture plan is that it would cost the people of the United States, the taxpayers, some \$200,000,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the Senator mean as a subsidy? If he does, the President never proposed a subsidy in any speech he ever made, nor does the American farmer, in my opinion, desire a subsidy.

Mr. FRAZIER. I do not think the American farmer does desire a subsidy, but he did have some hope during the campaign that he would be put on a parity with the manufacturing interests and other interests of the country.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Exactly; and that will be done. I have great faith that will be done, and that the farmer will be placed ultimately in that very position he deserves to occupy.

Mr. FRAZIER. The Senator from Indiana has just quoted Mr. Hoover, when a candidate for President, as stating that he could see no reason why a few hundred million dollars or several hundred million dollars should not be spent for the benefit of agriculture.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. We propose in this bill to spend \$500,000,000.

Mr. FRAZIER. As a loan; yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes; but ultimately there will be considerable in cost, and at the very outset we propose to pay out under this legislation \$500,000 which is appropriated for expenses.

Mr. FRAZIER. The sum of \$500,000 is a long way from several hundred million.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But \$500,000,000 is not.

Mr. FRAZIER. The \$500,000,000 to which the Senator refers is a loan; it is absolutely nothing but a loan.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No, Mr. President; it is an initial advance from the Treasury, just as the President said he was willing should be advanced from the Treasury; it has no association with anything else.

Mr. FRAZIER. By no stretch of the imagination can it be considered an advance, when it has got to be paid back with interest.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It is the initial advance. I do not care to quibble with the Senator as to the meaning of words. He knows as well as I do what these words mean. I do not understand that the President in that statement used any words which would indicate that he meant to make a gift of several hundred million dollars. The Senator may have a different view, but that is my view.

Mr. FRAZIER. It was so stated from public platforms all over the Nation by people who were out speaking for Mr. Hoover at that time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I suppose even the Senator from North Dakota will admit that Mr. Hoover can not be held responsible for everything that was said in his behalf by everybody.

Mr. FRAZIER. I think that is true.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Any more than he could be held responsible for what was said against him.

Mr. FRAZIER. In the letter from the President to the chairman of the Agricultural Committee of the Senate giving his reasons for opposing the debenture plan, after stating that he did not think the amount of the debenture would be reflected back to the farmer, he says.

Third. If the increased price did reflect to the farmer the plan would stimulate overproduction and thereby increase world supply.

The only meaning I can get from that is that the President would oppose any method of farm relief here that would increase the price of the farm product that might encourage overproduction; and, of course, any increase might encourage overproduction.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I am convinced that the Senator from North Dakota is not very friendly to the plan favored by the President. In fact, the Senator stated the other day that he was not so very favorably impressed with the President himself. My opinion is that everything the President

has said or done has kept faith with his promises to the American people.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I do.

Mr. FESS. The President's utterances here constantly refer to the platform.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. FESS. The Senator recalls that in the convention there was a terrific struggle to place in the platform some of the things that the Senator from North Dakota is advocating here.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. FESS. And those things were rejected overwhelmingly; and the President is referring to these as the pledge he has made.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Exactly.

Mr. FESS. It seems to me there is not any justification for the charge that this proposal will not do any good.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his suggestions.

Mr. President, permit me to read further from this acceptance address:

The first step is to create an effective agency directly for these purposes and to give it authority and resources. These are solemn pledges and they will be fulfilled by the Republican Party. It is a definite plan of relief. It needs only the detailed elaboration of legislation and appropriations to put it into force.

And then, skipping a few sentences, I read as follows:

While the problem varies with every different commodity and with every different part of our great country, I should wish to apply the same method to agriculture so that the leaders of every phase of each group can advise and organize on policies and constructive measures.

And still further, and then I shall not read any more from this speech:

The working out of agricultural relief constitutes the most important obligation of the next administration. I stand pledged to these proposals. The object of our policies is to establish for our farmers an income equal to those of other occupations; for the farmer's wife the same comforts in her home as women in other groups; for the farm boys and girls the same opportunities in life as other boys and girls. So far as my own abilities may be of service, I dedicate them to help secure prosperity and contentment in that industry where I and my forefathers were born and nearly all my family still obtain their livelihood.

Mr. President, on August 11 the President made his acceptance speech. Ten days later, on August 21, speaking at West Branch, his boyhood home, the President had the following to say:

I should, however, like to emphasize that the spirit of those legislative proposals is to work out a more economic and stable marketing system. A Federal farm board is to be set up with the necessary powers and resources to assist the industry to meet not alone the varied problems of to-day but those which may arise in the future. My fundamental concept of agriculture is one controlled by its own members, organized to fight its own economic battles, and to determine its own destinies. Nor do I speak of organization in the narrow sense of traditional farm cooperatives or pools, but in the much wider sense of a sound marketing organization. It is not by these proposals intended to put the Government into the control of the business of agriculture, nor to subsidize the prices of farm products, and pay the losses thereon either by the Federal Treasury or by a tax or fee on the farmer.

Mr. President, it seems to me that anyone who spoke for Mr. Hoover could have understood that language. I repeat it:

It is not by these proposals intended to put the Government into the control of the business of agriculture, nor to subsidize the prices of farm products and pay the losses thereon either by the Federal Treasury or by a tax or fee on the farmer. We propose, with governmental assistance and an initial advance of capital, to enable the agricultural industry to reach a stature of modern business operations by which the farmer will attain his independence and maintain his individuality.

And now, Mr. President, one other quotation from that speech at West Branch, made 10 days after the acceptance address:

In formulating recommendations for legislation to carry out the proposals of the party, I trust that we may have the full assistance of the leaders of agricultural thought.

Mr. President, a little later, on the 2d of November, at St. Louis—this was just a few days before the election, when

Mr. Hoover was on his way to the Pacific coast to cast his vote—he used the following language. Every one at that time was interested in what the President might say on this question:

In addition to the tariff and cheaper waterway transportation in assistance to agriculture, the Republican Party proposes to go further. It proposes to set up an institution which will be one of the most important institutions in our Government, designed to meet not only the varied problems which confront us to-day, but those which may arise in the future. We propose to create a Federal farm board composed of men of understanding and sympathy for the problems of agriculture; we propose this board should have power to determine the facts, the causes, the remedies which should be applied to each and every one of the multitude of problems which we mass under the general term "the agricultural problem."

This program further provides that the board shall have a broad authority to act and be authorized to assist in the further development of cooperative marketing; that it shall assist in the development of clearing houses for agricultural products, in the development of adequate warehousing facilities, in the elimination of wastes in distribution, and in the solution of other problems as they arise. But in particular the board is to build up with initial advances of capital from the Government, farmer-owned and farmer-controlled stabilization corporations which will protect the farmer from depressions and the demoralization of summer and periodic surpluses.

It is proposed that this board should have placed at its disposal such resources as are necessary to make its action effective.

Thus, we give to the Federal farm board every arm with which to deal with the multitude of problems. This is an entirely different method of approach to solution from that of a general formula; it is flexible and adaptable. No such far-reaching and specific proposal has ever been made by a political party on behalf of any industry in our history. It is a direct business proposition. It marks our desire for establishment of farmers' stability and at the same time maintains his independence and individuality.

This plan is consonant with our American ideals to avoid the Government operation of commercial business; for it places the operation upon the farmer himself, not upon a bureaucracy. It puts the Government in its real relation to the citizen—that of cooperation. Its object is to give equality of opportunity to the farmer. I would consider it the greatest honor I could have if it should become my privilege to aid in finally solving this the most difficult of economic problems presented to our people, and the one in which by inheritance and through long contact I have my deepest interest.

I am hopeful that in the December session of Congress it will be possible to reach that solution. However, as I have already said, if this is not possible I would call a special session in order that we might speedily arrive at a determination of the question before the next harvest.

And, Mr. President, with that statement from the lips of Herbert Hoover the people went to the polls and almost unanimously elected him to the Presidency. Immediately he kept his word by calling this special session of the Congress for the purposes of farm relief, as he had suggested.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. In the President's message to Congress he states, on page 3:

With the creation of a great instrumentality of this character—

And I think no other construction can be given to that than that he meant this Federal farm board—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is right; I agree with the Senator.

Mr. FRAZIER (reading):

of a strength and importance equal to that of those which we have created for transportation and banking, we give immediate assurance of the determined purpose of the Government to meet the difficulties of which we are now aware, and to create an agency through which constructive action for the future will be assured.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is right.

Mr. FRAZIER. I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana, or anyone else, if there is anything in either of the agricultural bills as reported out, outside of the debenture plan, that will do anything for the farmer such as the Federal reserve banking act does for the big banks, or such as the Interstate Commerce Commission with the aid of the Esch-Cummins railroad act does for the railroad companies?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes, Mr. President; I should say that this very Federal farm board that is proposed now—

Mr. FRAZIER. Does the Federal farm board have the authority that the Interstate Commerce Commission has to regulate freight rates?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. In my opinion, along these lines it has practically that authority.

Mr. FRAZIER. I should like to know where.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Of course, the Senator's interpretation of the bill and of the proposed legislation may be different from mine. I think this legislation, if enacted, will give the Federal farm board all the power it needs to solve this farm problem.

Mr. FRAZIER. All the power it needs?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And plenty of money with which to start.

Mr. FRAZIER. Does the Senator think it will give them the authority that the Esch-Cummins Railroad Act gives the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix tariff rates and to give the railroad companies a guaranteed profit?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I think it will in the end. This legislation may be amended, of course. These other measures of which the Senator speaks have been amended. For instance, the Federal reserve law has been amended so much in the last 14 years that the amendments occupy more space in the law books than the original law itself. I say this legislation will necessarily be amended from time to time, and perfected. All legislation is experimental, but in my opinion it is a fine start.

Mr. FRAZIER. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks there is anything in either the House bill or the Senate bill as reported from the Agricultural Committee, outside of the debenture plan, that will give any immediate relief?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I doubt whether the debenture plan would give immediate relief. That is just the point on which the Senator and I differ. I do not care to take a lot of time to discuss it, but my opinion is that in the end it would work against the farmer rather than for him and that after a year or two the farmer himself would insist upon its repeal, and by that time there would be increased production, and then we would have a worse agricultural problem than we have at this moment.

Mr. FRAZIER. The debenture plan is an emergency proposition, as I see it, and it is optional with the board as to whether they will put it into operation or not. There is no question in my mind but that if the tariff on any of our farm products is reflected back to the farmer who produces these products to the amount of 50 per cent of the tariff, the debenture plan would never go into operation; and if it does not reflect back to the producer at least 50 per cent of the tariff, then the debenture plan could go into operation and give the producer the advantage of 50 per cent of the tariff.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I assume that the Senator will agree with me that in the President's message to the Congress from which he has just quoted he is thoroughly consistent with his utterances throughout the campaign.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President, I am frank to say that I do not think the sentiment stated by the President in his objections to the debenture plan is thoroughly consistent with either the statements made in the message or his statements made during the campaign.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I think it is; and certainly it is consistent with the West Branch speech, to which I listened with a great deal of interest.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BROOKHART. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the first time it appeared that the President was opposed to price fixing was in this message. The first time it appeared that he was opposed to the Government buying and selling farm products was in this message.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No, Mr. President; the Senator was out, I think, a moment ago when I read from a speech the President made, the second official utterance of his in the campaign, at West Branch, Iowa, to which the Senator from Iowa himself listened.

Mr. BROOKHART. Yes; I heard it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. On which occasion the Senator himself spoke, and the presidential candidate, the Republican candidate—

Mr. BROOKHART. That was the first time I put out the record of Mr. Hoover in buying and selling farm products for the Government.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. All right. Mr. President, on that very occasion the distinguished Senator from Iowa, with me among others, heard the Republican candidate for President, Herbert Hoover, utter these words, and I quote them now:

It is not by these proposals intended to put the Government into the control of the business of agriculture, nor to subsidize the prices of farm products and pay the losses thereon either by the Federal Treasury or by a tax or fee on the farmer.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. That was in connection with his interpretation of the platform, that he had no patience with those who were opposed to spending several hundred million dollars from the Treasury, and that interpretation was to the effect that doing that did not put the Government in business or subsidize agriculture as explained in the West Branch speech. There is nothing in that inconsistent with the other statement at Palo Alto in the speech of acceptance.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, the Senator and I discussed that the other day, and we do not interpret the language used in the same way, I think. I say, however, that even if the Senator's interpretations were correct, the fact remains that the presidential candidate himself cleared up the language 10 days later, in the Senator's own State and in the presence of the Senator, when he used the words I just read.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. FESS. The Senator from Iowa suggests that that was the first time the President indicated that he was against price fixing. Certainly if the Senator does not know that Mr. Hoover all the way along was opposed to price fixing, when he was charged, as Secretary of Commerce, with dominating the President on the question, he is the only man in the Senate or out of it who does not know that.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. Hoover's representatives furnished me with his record for use in the campaign, and they furnished me the record of how he fixed the price on \$10,000,000 worth of farm products and how he maintained that price by buying and selling farm products, and in every speech, including the one I made at West Branch, I used those facts. Then Senators come in and say to me that I knew he was opposed to price fixing. The first knowledge I had of that, the first time it came categorically, was when this message appeared here. It did not appear in the campaign.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. FESS. Does the Senator from Iowa mean that the fact that when Mr. Hoover, in the Food Administration, was put in charge of the distribution of food for war purposes, and fixed the price, as an administrator, means that he is in favor of the Government fixing prices in peace times?

Mr. BROOKHART. I will explain that with regard to wheat. That is more definite than referring to the Food Administration. The documents were furnished me in connection with the wheat business, and also in reference to pork, by George Barr Baker. A board fixed the price of wheat at \$2.26 a bushel finally at Chicago. That was the cost-of-production price, the cost of production with a reasonable profit in addition to that. Then Mr. Hoover went out and bought and sold as much at one time as \$500,000,000 worth of wheat in order to maintain that price.

Mr. FESS. That was the Government doing it.

Mr. BROOKHART. He was doing it for the Government. He was the Government in that transaction. Then, after the war was over, President Wilson, by proclamation, promised the farmers the same price for wheat in 1919 that they got in 1918. Mr. Hoover asked a billion dollars from the Congress, and I presume the Senator voted for it.

Mr. FESS. I did.

Mr. BROOKHART. And they gave him that billion dollars. He did not have to use all of it, but he did use about \$300,000,000 of it. He quit the Wheat Corporation before the year was over, and it was on the 4th of March, the last day of Congress, when the billion dollars was voted. That is the record that was given to me to present to the farmers of the Northwest in order to win their votes for Herbert Hoover, and I did it.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FESS. And the Senator from Iowa wants the country to believe that because Mr. Hoover, the administrator in charge of feeding Europe, fixed the price by the Government, as he represented the Government, he believes in price fixing in peace time

being written into law, and if he does not do it then he is inconsistent. It seems to me the most incredible thing, Mr. President, that anyone here would say that because in an emergency in war time the Government had placed in the hands of an individual the buying and selling of food products in order to save our soldiers from starving, that that means he believes in the policy of price fixing. Mr. Hoover has from the beginning been an opponent of price fixing.

Mr. BROOKHART. The 1919 matter was after the war was over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. The law was passed after the war was over, on the 4th of March, 1919, and the emergency of the farmers was nothing like as great as it is now. I certainly believed that, I presented it in that way to the farmers, and the farmers believed it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, no matter how the Senator may feel about it now, the fact remains that he and I together at West Branch, Iowa, on the 21st of August of last year, listened to Herbert Hoover's speech, in the course of which he used the language I have just read, and that language should have disabused the Senator's mind to such an extent that he never would have needed to make any misstatement in the campaign, if misstatement he made.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. The records, which bear that out, show that there was no subsidy, and no subsidy necessary. In fact, instead of there being a subsidy, there was a profit of \$59,000,000 taken from those operations, and that money is safely tucked away in the Treasury of the United States right now.

If the Senator will permit me, I want to offer an amendment right now.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No, Mr. President; let the Senator offer it now, but I would like to have it come in the RECORD after I have concluded.

Mr. BROOKHART. I do not care for the printing of it in the RECORD at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. BROOKHART. That is what I wanted. The amendment provides for the use of such part of this same \$59,000,000 of profits taken, not subsidy but profits, as is necessary to pay the losses of these stabilization corporations, if they have any losses. We will see if they are willing to let the farmers have from the Treasury even that which they took from the farmers.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I was reading from the message of the President to the Congress of the United States at the time of the calling of this special session. I shall not go into that further. Suffice it to say that everything contained in this message is thoroughly consistent with the utterances of Herbert Hoover as the Republican candidate for President throughout the campaign and thoroughly consistent with the Republican platform adopted at Kansas City.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FRAZIER. I would like to ask the Senator from Indiana if he believes the message and the statements made by the President during the campaign were consistent with the arguments urged against the debenture plan in the letter to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes, Mr. President; I was just coming to that.

On the 20th day of April, 1929, the President wrote a letter addressed to the Hon. CHARLES L. McNARY, United States Senator. I shall not read the letter in full, because every Senator here is familiar with its contents, but I will read the opening paragraph, in answer to the Senator's query.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: On April 12 I received a call from yourself and Senators CAPPER, HEFLIN, NORBECK, and RANDELL, acting as a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, requesting my opinion on the "export debenture plan" for agricultural relief, since it is a complete departure from the principles already debated during the campaign.

That is the answer to the Senator's question. In the course of that letter from the President he gave 10 reasons why he was opposed and is opposed to the debenture plan. I shall not read further from the letter in that connection. The contents, as I said, are familiar to all the Members of the Senate.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. NORBECK. Did I understand the Senator correctly to state that the position of the President is all right because he did not promise the farmers much?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No, Mr. President. I wish the Senator had been here throughout this discussion. I have not hesitated to state what the President himself said on different occasions, that the President promised certain things, and the President has complied with those promises and fulfilled them all.

Mr. NORBECK. Did he ever promise the farmers a standard of living like that of other people in the country?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes, Mr. President; and I think this legislation is the beginning of that very happy condition we hope to bring about.

Mr. NORBECK. It is only the beginning?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Exactly; that is all that anyone can claim for it; but it is better to start and get the thing under way than to continue to be inactive year after year and make no start in the right direction.

Mr. NORBECK and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Of course, this is not the end; this is the beginning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield further to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. NORBECK. I wish the Senator would analyze the 10 reasons. He will find that 2 of them, for instance, are that, first, the farmers will not get the benefit of the debenture, and, second, that it will give them such a big advantage that they will overproduce and ruin themselves.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No, Mr. President. In the event the aid were rendered to the farmer, said the President, in the end it would work to the disadvantage of the farmer also.

Mr. NORBECK. It is a certainty that it can not do both, is it not?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No; the President makes a case on both sides of the question and shows that if those who contended either way were right the debenture in the end would not benefit the farmer.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. In just a moment. Before I yield, my opinion is that even the farmers from the great State of South Dakota are opposed to the debenture in its present form, as suggested, though the Senator knows more about his own State than I do, of course.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I read from the platform of the Republican Party of 1924:

The Republican Party pledges itself to the development and enactment of measures which will place the agricultural interests of America on a basis of economic equality with other industry to insure its prosperity and success.

Was that part of the platform carried out?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, the Republican Party has unquestionably been working on a plan of farm relief for years. Of course, there has been much difference of opinion, as the Senator well knows, and there is still some difference of opinion, but in the end the Republican Party will, as usual, solve this question and this problem as it has solved every other problem with which it has been confronted in the history of the country.

Mr. BARKLEY. It made practically the same promise in 1920—eight years ago—and the situation had gotten worse by 1924. In the platform of 1928 I find this language:

The Republican Party pledges itself to the development and enactment of measures which will place the agricultural interests of America on a basis of economic equality with other industries to insure its prosperity and success.

That is an exact copy of the promise made four years ago. Inasmuch as this promise was made in 1928, it was a confession that the promise made in 1924 was not carried out. What part of the Republican Party has been working on the solution of this problem for the last four years?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to his colleague?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. WATSON. I want to say to my good friend from Kentucky, in reply to his question, that seven years ago there were very few people in the United States who were willing even to admit that there was a farm problem. The House was Republican and the Senate Republican, and the Congress that met about that time began the consideration of the farm question,

and they debated it. At that time the House passed what was known as the Haugen bill. It came over to the Senate and the Senate debated it, and it was defeated.

In the next Congress, both branches again being Republican, the question once more came up for consideration. The House again passed it. It came over and the Senate passed it, being a Republican body. In the next Congress, the House being Republican, it again was taken up and passed there. It came over here and was passed by practically a two-thirds majority.

By the debates in both House and Senate in the successive Congresses, from a condition in which it was believed by scarcely anybody that there was a farm problem, public opinion was lashed to such a state that both political platforms last year declared it to be the foremost of all American problems, and both candidates pledged themselves to its immediate solution over and above any other question that confronts and perplexes the American people.

So I maintain that successive Republican Congresses, by having constantly and surely had this question to the front, have brought it to a situation where to-day it is demanded of the present Congress, called by the President for that purpose on a platform pledged to this very policy.

It is quite true that a Republican President, I will say to my good friend in anticipating his question, twice vetoed the bill; but, nevertheless, the Republican representatives of all those States in both House and Senate, obedient to the demands of the people, brought the question to such a state that to-day it is the foremost of all questions, and so declared by both platforms. Therefore I deny that the Republican Party has done nothing toward the solution of the question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment. I want to make an observation first.

I thank my colleague for what he has just suggested. What has been said by my colleague is, of course, true; and evidently the country believes that the Republican Party has been making an effort to solve the problem and has been accomplishing something, because in 1920, overwhelmingly, the people decided that the Republican Party was correct in what it was trying to do. In 1924—and the Senator read from the party platform of that year—again the Republican Party was overwhelmingly successful. In 1928—and the Senator read from that platform—it became almost unanimous, so I am surprised that the Senator should hark back over the years to read from the two platforms.

I yield now to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Following a similar declaration in 1920, and another one of the same nature in 1924, and still another one in identical language in 1928, admitting that during all the eight years there had been no progress except in conversation, we may look forward with anticipation to a similar platform in 1932, based upon the failure of the party in power to do any more in the next four years than it has done in the past eight years.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I assume that what the Senator has just stated was told by him to his people in Kentucky last year; but notwithstanding the eloquence of the able Senator from Kentucky, his State went Republican by 178,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not on the agricultural question.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Did not the Senator discuss agriculture in Kentucky last year?

Mr. BARKLEY. I discussed many things.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Did he discuss this question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I discussed agriculture, but not by itself. Neither did Indiana go Republican purely on the agricultural question. If it had, it might have repudiated the Senator from Indiana, who was elected notwithstanding the fact that he then opposed the position now taken by the President.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. FESS. I had hoped that the discussion would avoid merely political partisan issues, but I would like to have the privilege from my friend from Indiana to state to the Senator from Kentucky that in 1920 a pledge was made and in the administrations of Harding and Coolidge 16 different measures, separate and distinct, pertaining to agriculture, recommended by the best agricultural talent in America, were enacted into law, pronounced by William Jennings Bryan as the greatest program of farm rehabilitation ever undertaken by any country.

Later an authority no less than the American Farm Bureau made its report through its secretary enumerating 26 different

measures, all applying to the farm situation, and stated in its report that the program was the greatest program of farm legislation in all the history of the country from the adoption of the Constitution to the present time. That is as high an authority on agriculture as we can now find so far as I know.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BROOKHART addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. I want to call attention to the fact that those 26 great measures for the farmers of the United States got them into more trouble all the time and increased their debts and increased their difficulties and increased the foreclosure of their mortgages. They were little, trifling things compared to the main problem.

Mr. FESS. All of which the Senator from Iowa supported and urged.

Mr. BROOKHART. I supported some of them and pointed out that they meant but very little at the time. I remember the intermediate credit bank legislation. I tried to change that into a cooperative-bank plan. All those other things were merely trifling things. They did not meet the farm problem. The farm problem was solved at one time in this country. When the Food Administration was created and when the Wheat Corporation was created the farm problem was solved and the farmers got the best prices and had the best prosperity they have ever had in all the history of agriculture. When the time came to dissolve and discontinue those agencies, the great man who had managed them through all their success opposed their discontinuance, and if Herbert Hoover's advice had been listened to then, and if the Government had been kept in business—if that is what the Senator is pleased to call it—if it had continued to fix the price of those products at the cost of production plus a reasonable profit, the farmers would not have been deflated and the farm problem would not have existed as it does to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then let us follow Herbert Hoover's advice now. If the Senator from Iowa feels that his advice is good and safe and sound, let us follow Herbert Hoover's advice now. That is what the country expects us to do.

I want to invite the attention of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] to a statement made, since he has been reading statements from the Republican platform. I want to read a statement from a great Democrat, the last Democratic President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson. In the last 32 years we have had only one Democratic President. For some cause or other the people seem to distrust Democratic administrations. Woodrow Wilson was President from March 4, 1913, to March 4, 1921, eight years. The day before he went out of office, March 3, 1921, when he vetoed the agricultural tariff for the farmers of the country, he being the last Democratic President the country has had, used this language, and this statement is to be found at the end of his message to Congress:

I do not believe that the sober judgment of the masses of the people of the Nation, or even of the special class whose interests are immediately affected by this measure, will sanction a return, especially in view of conditions which lend even less justification for such action, to a policy of legislation for selfish interests which will foster monopoly and increase the disposition to look upon the Government as an instrument for private gain instead of an instrument for the promotion of the general well-being. Such a policy is antagonistic to the fundamental principle of equal and exact justice to all, and can only serve to revive the feeling of irritation on the part of the great masses of the people and of lack of confidence in the motives of rulers and the results of government.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 3, 1921.

And, Mr. President, does it not amaze you to find there in brackets the words "applause on the Democratic side"? That special class was the class composed of American farmers and those words were uttered by the last Democratic President of this country on March 3, 1921, the day before he went out of office. So evidently the Democratic Party considered the farmer to be of a special class that irritates "the great masses of the people." So, at any rate, said Woodrow Wilson.

I yield now to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Since those immortal words were uttered, being a correct statement of a principle for which the Democratic Party stands, and for which all parties are standing, I am sure no measure has been enacted by Congress under other administrations which have granted special privileges to the classes. It is by reason of those special privileges granted to two special classes that the farmer is in the situation he is in

to-day. If the Republican Congress saw fit to grant special privileges to certain classes, where is the inconsistency in undertaking to give the farmer the same advantage that others claim by reason of such special legislation?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the statement I have just quoted reflect the views of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; broadly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then the Senator feels that this special class deserves no special treatment.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator did not understand me to say that. If the Senator properly understood my words he understood me to say that because of special legislation enacted since those words were uttered granting to others the right to exploit the great majority of the people we may expect the farmer has the right to expect that he should be kept on an equal economic basis with other interests of the country.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I simply wanted to know whether the Senator from Kentucky subscribed to those views.

Mr. BARKLEY. I subscribe to them as a general governmental party policy.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Is it not reasonable to believe that in establishing an economic policy for the country we have to place all groups and classes upon the same basis? If we are to have a policy of high protection which of necessity will increase the cost of everything we use, if we are to have the labor union that increases the cost of labor, the farmer being a victim of both the high cost incident to fixing the tariff and the high cost due to the fixing of wages, is it not logical to conclude that the farmer too ought to be given the same attention? That is the view I take of it. I think we ought either to tear down the protective tariff and destroy the labor union, both unthinkable, or else we should place the farmer on the same plane of economic equality.

I supported Mr. Wilson. I am not familiar with the details of the particular message from which the Senator from Indiana quoted. What he had in mind was that with a more reasonable protective tariff there would not be the occasion to give the farmer that relief which he thought to be class legislation. But now we are engaged in a policy. I think the real reason why those words were uttered was that it was his thought that we might elevate the tariff so high for the benefit of the manufacturing class that it would be detrimental to the agricultural class. If we are going to do that, certainly in all good conscience we should give to the farmer the benefit of the same sort of legislation. That is the way it strikes me and that is the reason why I am favoring some kind of legislation that will help the farmer and lift him to the same plane of economic prosperity that the manufacturer enjoys to-day.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I think I would prefer to conclude in the morning, if that will be agreeable to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield if I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am advised that the Senator from Indiana desires to conclude his address to-morrow. For that reason I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator move an adjournment?

Mr. McNARY. I move an adjournment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise the Senator from Indiana that he can not retain the floor if an adjournment is taken. Does the Senator from Indiana yield for the purpose of an adjournment being moved at this time?

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I suggest that we had better take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I will assume that there will be no objection to-morrow to my finishing the remarks which I have begun this afternoon. I think 20 minutes will be sufficient to enable me to conclude to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana no doubt will be recognized by the occupant of the chair to-morrow when the unfinished business shall be laid before the Senate.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me? Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I promised several Senators that there would be an adjournment to-night, and I hope the understanding will be carried out in good faith.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Oregon for the purpose of moving an adjournment?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I am perfectly willing that an adjournment shall be taken at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 7, 1929, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, May 6, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of life and light, whom we love and trust, as the reach of our influence is near and far, direct and strong, we earnestly seek Thy guidance. Our lives are sacred trusts not only for ourselves but for many others. If we use them wisely, they shall be helped and shall be led to keep the grasp of their faith on powers that shape, hold, and transform society. Oh, may we take the wisdom and the sunlight of God and fling them back to men in sweet and blessed fragrance. However difficult our task and problems, give us courage and confidence. Keep us good at heart, doing our duty; ever diligent, faithful, and patient all the hours through. Father of mercies, we wait. One of us has just learned heaven's mysteries and beheld heaven's glory. Time has eased his grief and death has purged all darkness from his eyes. O prepare us for the great transition. In Thy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 3, 1929, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to extend the provisions of Public Resolution No. 92, Seventieth Congress, approved February 25, 1929.

ADJUSTMENT OF THE TARIFF

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, the readjusted tariff bill will be ready for introduction to-morrow at noon. [Applause.] The committee has had printed as a committee print for the use of Members and of the press 1,000 copies of the bill and also 1,000 copies of a tentative statement which will later constitute the body of the report when the bill has been formally reported by the committee.

The tentative report, or statement, for the use of the Members and the press for their information as to what has been done, will consist, first, of a statement by the chairman of the general purposes of the bill. Then there will follow a report by each subcommittee which had charge of the several schedules. For instance, there will be Schedule 1, chemicals, oils, and paints, which was considered by a subcommittee consisting of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HADLEY], chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. They will make such statement of the changes effected in that schedule as they desire. Following that, as will be true as to each schedule, the schedule will be printed under the Ramseyer rule. The existing law will be printed with the eliminated portions inclosed in black brackets and the new and additional matter, including the rates, will be printed in italics, so that by reference to any schedule or any paragraph it can readily be seen what the changes are.

A copy of the bill and this tentative statement will be delivered to the office of each Member to-morrow at noon and copies will be placed in the press gallery at the same hour.